STUDIA CELTICA, XXIX (1995), 127–223

Structural Sketches of Middle Welsh Syntax (I)*

ARIEL SHISHA-HALEVY
Department of Linguistics, Hebrew University of Jerusalem

(For Luisa, 'To whom I owe the leaping delight...')

The Converter Systems

Section 1: Preliminary
1.0 Aims, scope, method
1.0.1 General: the proposed systems: conversion and nexus types
1.1–3 Terminology
1.4 General linguistic implications

Section 2: Clause-constituent functions
2.0 Category I: clause-constituent functions—nominalizing converters
2.1 *a'ᵉʳ*: actantial nominalizing conversion
2.1.1 Specificity of the actantial nominalizer: *(yr) (hwn) a-*
2.2 *yd-*: nexus substantivizing conversion ('that'-nominalization)
2.3.1 Adnominal *a-* and *y-*:interrelations
2.3.2 The 'Abnormal Sentence' and the Cleft ('Mixed') Sentence: provisional notes
2.4 Clause-constituent negators
2.4.1 *na(t)'ᵉʳ*, *na-t-*
2.4.2 Adnominal *ny(t)-*: antecedent and relative-complex determination

Section 3: Discourse functions
3.0 Category II: discourse functions
3.0.1 *ny(t)-*: nexal negator
3.1 *neu-*, *neut-*: nexus focusing/superordinating conversion
3.1.1 Excurse I: Nexus focusing and typographical prominence in ModW
3.2 *y-*, *e-*, *zero(-ry)-*, *y(d)-*: present actualizing conversion ('egocentric'/reporting tense)
3.2.1 Excurse II: ModW *mi-/fe-*
3.2.2 Excurse III: *ys-*: adverbial-focus marker
3.3 The specific dialogic functions:
3.3.1 # *a-'ᵉʳ*...: interrogative
3.3.2 *zero-converter*...#: the responsive
3.3.3 #*zero-converter* + *1st singular aorist*#: performative
3.4 Lenition
3.4.1 Lenition marking parenthetic/thematic status of the verb
3.4.2 'Copular lenition': medial ('infixed') lenition marking noun-rheme nexal dependence

*Diolch o galon i D. Ellis Evans, Coleg Iesu, Rhydychen, cyfaill gwir, athro a chynghorwr doeth. My thanks also to Proinsias Mac Cana and T. Arwyn Watkins for patiently reading the typescript and making many useful suggestions. The responsibility for the text, however, remains with me.

subsystems) or narrative (links and delimitation [boundaries], peaks and dips, shifts, fore- and backgrounding).

While it is true that many of the forms or constructions here under study have in the past been observed on their own—most often, in historical, reconstructive and comparative perspectives—I believe that only a structural examination, which is synchronic, internal and static (i.e. non-transformative), can place the relevant phenomena in a true *système de valeur*. Often, the structural minutely-scanning approach appears to lead not only to better grammatical insight but also to more sensitive and (I trust) better understanding of the text.[3]

Historical, reconstructive and genealogical-comparative perspectives will as a rule be avoided in these studies (with a single exception, *viz.* the comparative examination of *neu-*). Not so observation of typologically significant features: as one who has for more than twenty years worked towards a fuller structural understanding of the Egyptian and Coptic grammatical systems, I shall want to make a stand and present a personal viewpoint on the sensitive issue of the non-Indo-European affinities of Celtic (and the late Heinrich Wagner's work). Literary Modern Welsh will be frequently referred to.

It would seem that, even in the most penetrating and painstaking discussions of syntax, it is corpus mixture (different periods, registers, dialects[?]) that impairs the description, weakens the statements and may lead to an inconsistent ensuing system. I consider the *Spezialgrammatik* approach to be a prime *sine qua non* component of the structuralist descriptive procedure.[4]

Very different from this is the call for fine system resolution between **textemes** and textemic subsets: not only between the macroscopic dialogic, expositive and narrative textemes but, microscopically, between, say, the allocution and response substructures of dialogue (see 3.3), between 'egocentric', interlocutive and delocutive spheres of personal reference, between the various 'layers' or 'channels' making up narrative texture, or the precisely formalized cotextual configurations 'enveloping' the Cleft Sentence and Abnormal Sentence, as **components of their formal idiosyncracies**.

Observations

1. I find Sabatini (1983) extremely instructive, bearing on the grammatical heuristics in our corpus. Concentrating on the relation between 'prodotti scritti' and the spoken-language sphere, Sabatini advocates (169) focusing our attention, not only on the texts themselves, but also on the communicative situation out of which they arise: 'dietro la stesura di quei testi appare sempre, mediato quanto si vuole, un atto di comunicazione a viva voce ...'; ... '"esecuzione" ad alta voce in situazioni di larga accessibilità' (171). This 'complex linguistic personality' of a corpus (189) is no doubt a weighty factor that must be taken into account when, for instance, we are to evaluate such 'formal data' as are at our disposal for distinguishing between the Abnormal and Cleft Sentence (probably the most difficult question of MW syntax: see below, 2.3.2), or the marking of elements as **rhematic**, conjointly and complementarily with pattern syntagmatics; or even the morphographemics of mutation. (The 'orality' feature of written texts has of course been long very trendy in

[3] Some instances: P 127, 403f., 537f., B 75, 438, PKM 75.23.

[4] Even for 'Early MW' (Simon Evans 1964: xixf.) the resolution offered is insufficient: the grammatical difference in detail between different texts is quite amazing, and the various criteria are as a rule not coextensive.

Section 4: Junctors
4.0 Junctors
4.0.1 On junctors in general
4.1 *pan*^{lm}, *ban*^{lm} 'that', 'when' ('whence')
4.1.1 *pan* 'that'
4.1.2 *pan-/ban-* 'when'
4.1.3 *pan* interrogative adverb: 'whence?'
4.2 *o-* 'if'
4.2.1 *tra*^{lm} 'while', 'for as/so long as'
4.3 (*h*) *yny*^{lm} 'until'

Section 5: <*bot*> etc.
5.0 The conversion system for <*bot*> and related themes
5.0.1 Tabular overview
5.1 *mae, oes, yw*: delocutive and existential
5.2 *wy=, y=*: interlocutives
5.3 *oed*
5.4 *b-* forms

Section 6: A note on *ry*^{lm}

Section 7: Celtic typology and affinities: a personal standpoint

Terminological defining glossary

Bibliographical list

1. Preliminary

1.0 Aims, scope, method

This article is the first in a series of corpus-based profiles or sketches of certain central subsystems of Mabinogi Middle Welsh grammar.[1] These aim at putting pattern-sets, patterns and pattern details in their proper perspectives of values, relevancies and relationship network, by applying structural-analytic procedure to complex phenomena of syntax hitherto not treated systemically in this approach, *viz.* in terms of oppositions and neutralizations, of paradigmatic (categorial constituency) and syntagmatic (compatibility) properties, commutabilities and compatibilities.[2]

Beyond the characterization of patterns (by constituency, component sequence, segmentally evident prosodic features, negation, etc.). I shall attempt, where possible and relevant, to formulate statements of their macrosyntactic—ultraclausal, junctural and textological—properties and roles, within their respective textemes: dialogic (with allocutive/reactive

[1] Following the present sketch, I hope to discuss Noun Predication ('Nominal Nexus'); Focussing and the Cleft Sentence; the Narrative Tense Systems. My description is based on the Four Branches (using PKM and the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies—'Medieval and Modern Welsh Series'—*Pwyll* and *Branwen* ('P', 'B'); 'PKM' for Manawydan and Math; *Owain* (in the same series, 'O') and *Culhwch ac Olwen* will be used for control purpose. Other texts will be referred to, in passing, for corpus comparison.

[2] As some of the terms I shall be using, or some of their connotations, may be idiosyncratic to certain schools of linguistic analysis, I thought it of use to append to the actual discussion a kind of selective terminological defining glossary; further terms will be added in subsequent sketches.

literary studies—see Zumthor 1983, esp. chapters I, II, V—and has been applied to our texts (Watkins 1988: 7; Jones 1988: 127: 'transcription of something composed in the head and for the ear'; Davies 1989: 50, 70f.). Still, I do not think it superfluous to point to its grammatical implications once again: the differences of the written and oral linguistic code are potentially so drastic, that the peril for consistent description of treating this special complex textual type as normal written discourse cannot be exaggerated.

2. What I see as both goal and prime principle of linguistic investigation (with its conclusions presented as 'descriptive statements') is the **decoding** analytic procedure, that is the resolution of the minutiae of the signalling system that is manifested in *la parole*, with the linguist in the **listener's** (reader's, decoder's) role. It is not 'hard and fast rules' we are after, nor 'the *post hoc* explanation of [the language-user's] choice', nor 'interpretation of the speaker's intent[ion]', much less 'reconstructing production rules on the basis of the finished product'—all the more so in a dead language (Fife and Poppe *apud* Fife 1988: 95f., 101 etc.). What the linguistic analyst does is, in simplistic terms, correlate a package of formal data to one of semantic (con-, co- and extra-textual) features, one (or, less desirably, some) of which are our 'X', our unknown factor. More precisely, we strive to define the **identity** (in terms of syntagmatic/paradigmatic intersection), hence the **value** (in a *système de valeur*) **of a given element**; we present these findings in statements of opposition and neutralization (both 'in a given environment').

3. In my view, the descriptive findings, the function-and-value statements resulting from structural analysis ought to be **non-dynamic** (the only dynamic feature in synchrony being the text's cumulative linear progression) as well as **non-hierarchical**: expressions and terms like 'dislocation', 'deletion', 'extraction' and 'movement', 'lower/higher (clause)', 'primary/secondary', are alien to grammatical structure, where it is only the tension of systemic interrelatedness that harnesses elements together.

4. Celtic grammatical description—and the set of features here studied is a fine case in point—appears to have had more than its deserved share of that triad of methodological handicaps which de Boer repeatedly rebuked, as 'la manie de l'explication historique', 'la supersition du passé' and 'la tyrannie de la forme'. For several reasons, which I shall forbear to enumerate here, Celtic linguistics actually managed to leap from the pre-linguistic 'traditional' (school-grammar-format) phase straight to the 'theory-of-grammar' meta-meta-linguistic generative phase, skipping, with some brilliant exceptions, the brief period of decoding, signal-resolving structural analysis granted other languages. Thus, insensitively imposing on Welsh grammar 'logical' or language-philosophy biased, and then ethnocentrically transmitted, distinctions (of which the aprioristic part-of-speech system is probably the most classic instance)[5] is sometimes compounded by fashionable theory-trumpeting, which makes—to follow the metaphor through—the sophisticated, intricate and delicate orchestration of the grammatical features themselves almost inaudible. Universalistic claims must be checkable (a task at present impossible), and cannot be accepted as **argument**.[6]

[5] 'No logical scheme of the parts of speech—their number, nature and necessary confines—is of the slightest interest to the linguist...Everything depends on the formal demarcations' (E. Sapir, *Language*, 125); '...les catégories purement sémantiques ou psychologiques qu'on vient à établir, n'ont jamais de chance de coincider avec les catégories vraiment grammaticales' (Hjelmslev 1928:30).

[6] 'Topics can govern verb agreement', Fife 1988:117, is pitifully ineffective as argument for deducing the topic-hood of the opening element in the Welsh 'Abnormal Sentence' from the frequent personal concord between it and the verb.

5. It goes without saying that the basic realization, ensuing from the essence of the linguistic sign, that a formal grammatical feature—be it morphemic, tagmemic or prosodic—cannot be 'meaningless' ('affirmative', 'declarative', 'pleonastic', 'semantically indifferent', 'does not modify the meaning [of the verb]' are some usual synonyms, in the subsystem of grammar under discussion here) must be respected. Statements of 'meaninglessness' are in fact the white flag of descriptive defeat, and stem from taking the *signifié* of the formal element in point in ethnocentric terms of **translatability** or at best tagmemic functions with 'traditional' (but often praeter-analytical) analogies. At the same time, of course, it is no less than hubris to claim that those functional resolutions that **we** cannot at present, with our analytical tools, define are just not there, like Malta in the message telegraphed by the Turkish admiral charged to bombard it.[7]

6. Experience in other linguistic fields (for instance, Romance linguistics) warns us of the rashness in: (a) assuming simple historical sequences (such as Old Welsh – Early Middle Welsh – Later Welsh) **on the data basis of written corpuses** (naturally the only data basis we have), and then postulating a diachronic 'replacement' of one feature by another; and (b) implicitly taking the 'classical' literary language as representative in some way of 'the language' in general, and even of the **spoken** idiom. This is of considerable relevance for the present study (e.g. bearing on the issue of word-order in the verbal sentence and the Abnormal Sentence).

7. I shall in the present study as a rule avoid diachronic statements, either in a full 'diachronic scenario', or as a synchronic phase in its diachronic context; statements on and illustration from Modern Welsh are to be taken from the **contrastive** and **typological** perspective. Similarly, comparison is typologically meant, even in the case of Irish, whose 'heritage burden' is much heavier than that of Welsh.[8]

1.0.1 General: the proposed systems: conversion and nexus types

In the following Tables, the different paradigm (category) systems are presented, or **converters**, **junctors**, **conjunctions**,—with their functions and substitution-lists:

Observations

1. In the following systematization we are in fact continuously dealing with **two asymetrical concomitant systems**, an affirmative and a negative one, which conjoin as two subsystems only on the level of a first synthesis; they are not coextensive, hence not covalent, and, strictly analytically, a (double) overhead subsuming them both is unwarranted. The negator morphs (2.4, 3.0.1) are converters in commutation, i.e. constitute one category

[7] Lewy 1967:220: 'Wir können sicher sein, dass die irischen Schriftsteller ihre Sprache noch besser gekonnt haben als die heutigen Grammatiker', on the 'meaninglessness' claim for OI *co?*. Terminological pigeonholes have a lot to answer for in this connection. I could not disagree more with L. Hjelmslev's 'la terminologie est une question de goût, elle ne touche pas aux réalités' (1928:57); while linguistic 'realities' as such may well be phantom images, our perception of phenomena is incessantly, consciously and unconsciously, conditioned and programmed by terms we use, which in turn are for us associated at best with prior or extraneous linguistic experiences or at worst even non-linguistic (e.g. logical) conceptualizations. Terms, far from being harmless conventional empty tags, may prove insidious spore-like fragments and reflections of previous and alien models, hypotheses, conceived systems.

[8] See Koch, in *Comp.Literature Studies*, 27 (1990) 34f. on the persistence of the Indo-European comparative viewpoint in current Celtic linguistic research.

and are mutually exclusive, with the affirmative ones on their left in their functional range in the Tables. The negative clause—always different in synchronic properties, in structural standing, usually in history—is **not a transformation** of an affirmative one.

2. It is striking that the negative clause pattern system matches the affirmative one much more closely in dialogue than in the different layers of narrative, where we witness the extreme meagreness of the negative paradigm confronted with the affirmative one. The narrative—a loosely or closely textured succession of staged, more or less dynamic, more or less unilinear, eventual or scenic constituent blocks, is an **essentially affirmative texteme**.

The negative clauses are typically intervals of discontinuity, **delimitations**, in the narrative texture. (The narrative roles here suggested are approximative, summarily and in part provisionally defined; the Mabinogi narrative tense system will be specially treated in a forthcoming paper):

(affirmative)	(negative)
(PRO)NOUN a- + *VERB* (narrative carrier)	*ny(t)-* + *VERB*
ADV y- + *VERB* (narrative carrier)	
INF concatenations (narrative carrier)	
INF a wnaeth (narrative-function [interepisode 'dip' or seam] tense)	
sef a wnaeth (narrative-function ['build-up' pre-peak] tense)	
presented-nexus clauses ('llyma': dramatic-description tense: 'suddenly', 'immediately')	
y-+ *VERB* (rare; reporting tense?)	*ny(t)-* + *VERB*
focal.-nexus clauses (narrator's channel tense)	*neg.focal.-nexus*
noun-rheme nexus clauses ('3-dimension' description tense)	*neg.noun-rheme nexus*

In the following tables, parentheses ('*na(t)-*') envelope (allo-) morphophonemic features, while hyphens ('*na-t-*') mark morphosyntactic ones.

Converters

Exponents or signals of text-syntactic status: non-binary actualizers, constituting essential components of their clause (i.e. their absence constitutes a zero).[9]

[9] The converters stand in close juncture with the converted nexus patterns, with only infixed pers. pronouns and/or the aspect preverb *ry-* penetrating this juncture (Morgan 1952: 148ff., Evans 1964: par.58 ff.). Converted forms are as a rule coordinated to the same conversion (*a- ac a-*, *y- ac y-*: e.g. P 412f., B 90) or to structurally equivalent forms (*ac a- ac ysyd ac a-*, PKM 59, 60); junctors are differently coordinated: *ynv- ac y-*, P 644f., B 376f.) See below for details of specific converters.

Category I: clause-constituent functions: substantivators

affirmative system:	*negative system*:
a$^{l\sim}$ / Ø-[oed, ry-]+ verbal nexus actant-nucleus substantivator	
	ny(t)$^{l\sim}$ + verbal nexus (*ny-t-* + non-verbal nexus) indefinite, non-specific actant- and circumstant-nucleus substantivator
y(d)- + verbal nexus (*pan-yw-* + non-verbal nexus nexus ('that') substantivator	*na(t)*$^{l\sim}$ + verbal nexus (*na-t-* + non-verbal nexus) nexus ('that') substantivator

Category II: Discourse functions

(a) texture and information-structuring functions:

affirmative system:	*negative system*:
y(d?)- + verbal nexus actualizing 'egocentric' reporting tense?	
neu$^{l\sim}$ + verbal nexus *neu-t-* + non-verbal nexus nexus focusing (dialogue); superordination (narrative)	*ny(t)*$^{l\sim}$ + verbal nexus *ny-t-* + non-verbal nexus negative delimitation
lenition (medial or infixed) noun-rheme nexus	
lenition + verbal nexus parenthethic	

(b) dialogic structuring and act-of-speech functions:

affirmative system:	*negative system*:
a$^{l\sim}$ + verbal nexus *a-e/y-* + non-verbal nexus nexus interrogative; constituent disjunctor: 'either ... or ...'	*po-ny(t)-* + verbal nexus *po-ny-t-* + non-verbal nexus rhetorical interrogative
Ø- + verbal nexus (aorist tense) Ø- + non-verbal rheme all persons: responsive 1st singular: performative	*na(c)*$^{l\sim}$ + verbal nexus (responsive; constituent

[some persons: finite modal forms]	disjunctor: 'neither … nor …' [some persons: finite modal forms]

Junctors

exponents of binary (in-pair) temporal/conditional interclausal relation: non-actualizers; prefixed to the clause. Non-essential: their absence does not consitute a zero.
pan'ᵉ⁼ + verbal nexus: 'when…' (affirmative only)
tra'ᵉ⁼ + verbal nexus: 'while, as long as…' (affirmative only)
yny'ᵉ⁼ + verbal nexus 'until…' (negative: *hyt na-*)
o(t)- + verbal nexus: 'if'
o-s- + non-verbal nexus: 'if'

Conjunctions

(rather 'conjunctional syntagms')—adverbial-status (prepositional) phrases with a nexus constituent: 'verbal nexus marked for adverbial status':
['*prepositions*']*-y(d)-* + VERB ('prepositions': out of the lexical inventory of this word-class)

1.0.2 Nexus types

Observation

The following classification is a modified application of the principle, accepted in Semitic linguistics by the end of the nineteenth century and in Egyptian-Coptic linguistics by the 1920s, of classifying sentence-types solely by the part-of-speech (or rather word-class) 'membership' of the predicate (rheme). This syntactic typology has been rarely applied to Indo-European, for the reason (and with the consequence) of the pervasive verb-orientated view of the predication systems; yet for Celtic I find it definitely apt.

An important factor in the distribution and form of converters is the type of nexus converted. In MW we encounter the following six primary 'theme + rheme', presentative and existential formal types (as distinct from **clause patterns**. Nexus may be **basic** (simple) or **complex** ('second-power'), with a simple nexus as component of an overlaying one. For all of these further investigation is still necessary, for greater precision and better resolution.

(a) VERBAL NEXUS ('verb', 'finite verb form'—basic and componential): *teiml-wn* (1st sg.), *a-wn* (hortative, 1st pl.), *gwel-ei*, *dywed-af*, *erch-y*, *nessa-ant*, *car-Ø*, eistedo-*Ø*, *bu-Ø*:

Simple: nexus between suffixed pronominal (or *zero* + nominal) theme and lexemic verb (base, stem).

Complex: (very rare in our corpus): *#y-* + *VERB#* (3.2); *Ø-* + *VERB* (responsive; probably); focusing nexus, see (c) below. The verbal nexus is richest in conversion terms. It is triply actualized: (1) by tense/aspect/mood affixes, (2) by personal-pronoun theme suffixes, (3) by converters, see below.

(b) NOUN-RHEME NEXUS ('Nominal Sentence'—basic nexus, or overlaying complex nexus), between a nominal or pronominal theme and a nominal, pronominal or adjectival rheme: *Wy-wreic-i yw* 'She is my wife' / *Y mab hwnn mab yti yw* 'This child, he is a son of yours' / *Puy yr yniuer?* 'Who is the company?' / *A wyt iach di?* 'Are you well?' / *Aryant oed y bwrd* 'The table was silver' / *Llawen uu y iarlles wrthunt* 'The lady was glad to see them' / *Nyt-hoff honno* 'This is not praiseworthy' / *Neu-t-teruynedic angheu y mi* 'It **is** definite death for me' / *Ys-gwir* 'Truly so' / *Sef lliw oed amunt claerwyn llathreit* 'The colour they had was shining bright white'. This is a complex pattern set, with different sequences and constituencies and several copula allomorphs; special disucssion of this pattern is forthcoming. This nexus type is only partly convertible (discourse-function conversion only) and is unconverted in unmarked status. It too is triply actualized: (1) by rheme determinators, (2) by thematic personal pronouns, (3) by converters. Note that many noun-rheme patterns have 'predicative + verb' allotagms, using *bu, oed* etc: these too are non-verbal nexus types, as is proved by their distinctive nominalizations (*pan yw* etc.).

Observation

In MW, this type is basically **pronoun-theme** (with a zeroable pronominal theme). Not so in Irish, nor in ModW, where an infinitival theme alternates, in the negative, with a *na-* clause: *Braf cael byw yma, Bechod i'r tywydd droi, Rhyfedd na-, Piti na-, Bron na-, Ofn i rywbeth ddigwydd i'r borth ac na-fydd hi ddim yno y tro nesaf...(Pigau'r Sêr)*. Needless to say, we do find #Noun-Noun# nexus in composition, in the types *gwyn ei byd* and *nerthfawr*, both with an adjectival rheme and apparently with a restricted (not closed!) inalienable lexemic theme constituency.

(c) CONSTITUENT 'NEXUS', usually disjunctive (noun phrases, verbs, adverbials: 'either – or', whether...whether...' 'neither...nor' 'be it...') and always converted: *ae tir ae dayar ae aur ae aryant* '...be it land, territory, gold or silver...' / *ae o gae ae o uodrwy ae o uaen guerthuawr* '...be it of a brooch, ring or precious stone...' / *na gur na gwreic* '...neither man nor woman' / *Na'y werthu na'y ollwng na-s-gwnaf i* '...neither sell it, nor release it, I shall not do it'. This may be regarded as a sub-type of Nominal Sentence, with the constituent element rhematic and a formal 'it'-type theme present—usually zeroed but overt in some conversion circumstances.

(d) FOCALIZATION NEXUS (an overlaying complex nexus): *Paham y-rody-di attep y-uelly?* 'Why do you answer in this way?' / *Beth a wnawn?* 'What shall we do?' / *Wrth-hynny y gelwir etwa Calch Llassar* 'It is for this that it is still called C. Ll.' / *Lle drwc yd ym* 'It is in a bad spot that we are' / *Ay-kyscu yd wyt ti?* 'Is it asleep you are?' / *Tidi, Owein, yssyd arglwyd* 'It is you, O., who are lord' / *Pa-uab yssyd i'th ol di?* 'What child is it I see following you?' / *Ponyt llygoden a welaf?* 'Is it not a mouse I see?' / *E ymdeith yd aeth* 'Away he went' / *Sef a wnaeth ynteu edrych* 'What he did was look...' / *Sef dial a wnaethant, gyrru Branwen o un ystauell ac ef* '(and) that is the revenge they took, drive B. out of the same chamber as he'. This is a special type of complex nexus (with verbal, nominal, adverbial or existential constituent basic nexus), with no formal nexus exponent (segmental copula) when the nexus is unconverted and affirmative: it is formally moulded in the rheme-initial #NOMINAL + NOMINAL# or #ADVERBIAL + NOMINAL# matrix. We find here two distinct, complementarily distributed patterns, differing in their thematic structure and cotextual functional perspectives:

(1) the focus-initial Cleft Sentence (*'Brawddeg Gymysg'*): with converted (substantivized) verbal nexus as theme, following a (pro)nominal/adverbial focus (=rheme). This pattern is evidently related to the rheme-initial delocutive Nominal Sentence;

(2) topic (theme)-initial, focus-final pattern, with *sef-* a cataphoric focusser, and again a substantivized-verb topic, but a topic/focus constituency and cotextual value and integration quite different from those of (1), (Special detailed discussion of (1) and (2) forthcoming.)[10]

Observation

The Cleft Sentence without a segmental nexus exponent is typologically interesting, and a deviation from the normal 'North-West-European' Cleft Sentence: see Beckman 1934: 29ff., 42 n.1 (the type 'où que tu vas?' is a French dialectal feature). This copula-less Nominal Sentence (cf. the so-called 'brawddeg enwol bur', see Morgan 1952: 283ff., Richards 1970: 6f., with most of the later 'normal' evidence calque-translated from Biblical idiom; the earlier evidence is genre-marked: poetical or gnomic) is truly attested in certain interrogations (*pwy-/beth-* ?, PKM 79, *Culhwch ac Olwen* 791, 985); also exclamatively and modally; a different subtype is the adnominal 'exocentric' *'gwyn ei fyd'*, on which more below. In ModW dialogue we find another subtype with thematic infinitive (affirm.) or *na-* (neg.), following a closed list of special themes: *gwell / gwir / lwc / gresyn / piti* (*biti*) / *trueni / siawns* + inf./*na-*; also with content-referent demonstrative: *lwc hynny*.

(e) PRESENTATIVE STATEMENT (basic and overlaying complex nexus): a deictic type type of existential statement. The presented constituent has rhematic (predicative) second actant status. In dialogue, it is cataphoric:

(1) presented noun phrase (or substantival converted verb, in complex nexus) 'stated to exist in deixis': *Nachaf twryf mwyhaf yn y byt* 'Behold here the greatest uproar in the world' (narr. descriptive) / *Llyma yr aniueileit a dywedeisti* 'Here are the animals you said' / *Llyma ual y gelly* 'Here is how you can' / *Nachaf y clywynt diaspedein* 'Behold they heard an outcry' (lit. 'that they heard...'); not convertible;

(2) presented [noun phrase + adnexal ('predicative' or rhematic) relative expansion] (a construction presenting as rhematic the entire nominal theme + verbal rheme complex, cf. French 'voilà/c'est/il y a) maman que me bat'): this, I believe, is the construction which, in a generalized and to a degree devalued role, is identical with the one known as *'Brawddeg Annormal'*, superficially homonymous with the focalization Cleft Sentence (see discussion below, 2.3.2; special detailed discussion forthcoming), but also in the responsive substructure of dialogue, responsive-explicative cases with the pragmatic-situation as theme (*Py-diaspedein yw hunn weithon?*)—*Y gurda bieu y gaer yssyd uarw*... 'What outcry is that now?'—'[It is that] the gentleman, whose castle this is, is dead');

(3) presented adverbial nexus: *Llyma [hitheu yn burw neit allan]* 'Here she jumps out' (dramatic narrative) / *Llyma Owein [wedi goruot arnaf i]* 'Behold, O. has overcome me' / *Nachaf [honno yn aeduet]* 'Here it (the corn) is ripe'. Not convertible.

Observation

(PKM 51) *Llyma yn goleuhau pob lle* '(Suddenly) all became light' is a case, rare but definitely attested, of a adverbial rheme preceding its nominal theme – a construction the matrix of which informs the Cleft Sentence with adverbial foxus and *y*-topic ([d](1) above).

[10] See 3.2, Obs.2 for a rare *#y* + ADVERBIAL# topic-initial Cleft Sentence.

(f) EXISTENTIAL STATEMENT (basic, componential in, or overlaying complex nexus). As a rule located (this including possessed) existence; see 5.1): *Y mae yno ryw ystyr hut* 'There is some magic meaning there' / *Mae yma mab it* 'Here is a son for you' / *A oes ohonawchi a adnappo?* 'Is there any one who might know?' / *Yno y mae y llech* 'It is there that the slab is' / *Pa-chwedleu yssyd yma?* 'What news are there?' / *Tirionwch ac ymdidan hygar a uu y ryngthunt* 'tenderness and affectionate talk was there between them'. The existant may be an indefinite nominal, but also adverbial nexus, (g) below (schematically *Y mae* [*y-enw yn parawt*] 'His name is ready'), or even focalizing or nominal nexus, in a non-verbal nexus substantivizing role: *Llyna uy-attep i iti... y mae* [*ti a dewissswn*] 'Here is my answer to you:...that it is [you that I would choose]' ...*medylyaw y mae* [*Lleu oed yr eryr*] '...thinking that it was [L. that the eagle was]'. See section 5 for the special conversion system of <*bot*>.

(g) ADVERBIAL-RHEME or STATAL NEXUS (basic, componential in complex nexus): *Meuyl ymi* 'Shame on me!' / *Graessaw urthyt* 'Welcome to you!' / *Dyd da itt* 'A good day to you!' / *gellast a* [*chanawon genti*] 'A bitch with pups' / *Dyret titheu dy-hun ymyuw a-*[*dillat reudus amdanat*] *a-*['*r got y'th law*] 'You yourself, come in with shabby clothes, and with the bag in your hand...', *quelet* [*gur kyuurd kymoned a thidi yn crogi...*] '...seeing a man so worthy and so dignified as yourself hanging...'/ ...*ac* [*ef yn guybot*] '...and he knowing...'; Included also *in statu adverbiale*: (PKM 52) *eu kedymdeithon e hun wedi eu colli* '...their friends themselves lost,...'. 'Autonomous' examples are modal (exclamative-optative); otherwise this nexus type is in included status, either as object actant or by the 'including' *a-* (Jespersen's 'subnex', my adnexal: either adverbal or adnominal to an indefinite noun), presented ([e]) above), or existential ([f] above). Rheme-initial exx. are rare (*yn didan gan Pryderi ymdidan ac ef* 'delightful was for P. talking with him').

1.1 Terminology

In general, current usage[11] has—rather erratically, certainly without definition or systematization, and ignoring the theoretical issue of identity and homonymy—'**preverbal particle**' (early in *Intr.*; often just '**particle**', *geiryn* [*rhagferfol*]; 'particles', subsumed under 'adverbs' in *WG*; 'Partikel' in Wagner 1959; both 'Praeverbien' and 'Verbalpartikeln' in *Vergl.*, but 'conjunction', 'adverb', 'preverb', 'pronoun' and 'particle' in *Comp.*; 'presentential particle' is an occasional modern variant). This is used alongside the traditional and essentially imported 'conjunction' [*cysylltiad, cysylltair*][12] and/or (usually for *a-*, partly for *y-*, *ny-*, *na-*) 'relative pronoun' [*rhagenw perthynol*]. *Treigl.* treats our 'junctors' (below) apart as *cysyllteiriau rhagferfol* (e.g. pp. 270ff.,

[11] Abbreviations used in this paragraph: Comp.: Lewis-Pedersen 1961, Cystr.: Richards 1970, GMW: Evans 1964, Intr.: Strachan 1909, Treigl.: Morgan 1952, Vergl.: Pedersen 1913, WG: Morris-Jones 1913. 'Preverbal particles', 'verbal particles', just 'particles' or even, not entirely satisfactorily, 'preverbs' are found in use in the grammatical analysis of modern Irish: see Ó Sé 1986 (e.g. 101f, for the *-r* augment, interrogative *an-*, subordinating *go-*, the negators *ni-* and *ná-*, and of course the relative, for which see already O' Nolan 1919: 88ff. In his structural analysis, Denez 1974 argues very cogently against the 'pronominal terminology' for Breton relative *a-*: he considers it (266f.) a 'verbal particle' which marks a preceding noun/pronoun as subject or object.

[12] A similar terminological quandary is characteristic of treatment of languages for which a weak descriptive tradition exists (e.g. Anatolian languages: Carruba 1969, distinguishing 'Satzpartikel', 'satzeinleitende Partikel' and 'konjunktionelle Partikel') or else of elements previously ignored or underplayed in description (e.g. Fleischmann 1991, Old French *si*: 'adverb'/'particle'/'conjunction').

278, 291, 380). Occasionally, no special term is used at all (cf. in *Cystr.* '*a gofynnol*', '*nad perthynol*', beside '*geiryn*', '*rhagenw*', '*cysylltair*'). Usage, complicated especially for *a-* and the various *y-* morphs, seems to be confusedly or lightly 'functional', that is, tagging vaguely conceived syntactic roles by imported, 'universal' code-names.

More specifically, *WG, GMW, PKM, Treigl., Vergl., GPC*, the modern editions of *Pwyll* and *Branwen*, and (for ModW) Williams 1980 use the following terms for the enumerated morphs, often within a few terminological traditions. See further details below, under the respective converters:

a- ('relative'): 'particle' (*GMW*, in the Abnormal Sentence and 'Improper Relative Clause'), but 'rel. pronoun' elsewhere – so too *Treigl.*, *Owein*, Williams 1980; 'rel. pronoun' *GFC*; 'Verbalpartikel', '*relative(s) (Wort) a-*' (*Vergl.*, 'rel pronoun, in title, *Comp.*), 'relative particle' (*Pwyll, Branwen, Owein*), 'affirmative particle' (*ibid.*, in Abnormal Sentence).

na(t)-/ny(t)- 'negative particles', under 'adverbs' (*WG*), 'negative' (GMW); Williams 1980: 'rel. pronoun or particle' (in rel. clauses, incl. time expressions), 'preverbal particle' (in noun-clause, following prepositions, *pe*); 'g(eiry)n. a chys(ylltair) neg(yddol).' (*GPC*) '*cysylltair*' / '*rhagenw perthynol (traws)*' / '*geiryn ...perthynol*' (*Treigl.*), 'Negation' (*Vergl.*).

na(c)= 'neg. particle', under 'adverbs' (*WG*); 'conjunction' (Williams 1980, in disjunctions), 'preverbal particle' (*ibid.*, responsive and imperative), 'negative' (*GMW*) 'negative particle' (*GPC*, in several entries), 'Negation' (*Vergl.*)

y-, yd-, yr- 'Verbalpartikel' '(syntaktisches) Präverb' (*Vergl.*), 'preverbal particle' (Williams 1980), 'affirmative particle' and 'rel. pronoun' (*WG*), '*geiryn perthynol traws*' (*Treigl.*), 'conjunction' (Williams 1980), 'geiryn berfol', 'rhagenw perthynol' (*PKM*), 'preverbal particle' (*GMW*)—a single entity, incl. 'that' and 'Improper Relative' roles). 'Oblique rel. particle' 'conjunction and oblique rel. particle', 'preverbal particle, especially with pres. and impf. of bot' (*Pwyll*, R.L. Thomson, p. 70, sub 3., 4., 8.); 'affirm(ative) part(icle), preceding the verb'—one single entity for various roles (*Branwen*, D.S. Thomson, p. 74, sub 4.).

neu- 'affirmative particle' (*WG*, under 'adverbs'; *Owein*, *Pwyll*), 'preverbal particle' (*GMW*) 'geiryn cadarnhaol' (*PKM*, *Treigl.*); 'particle', (*GPC*), 'Verbalpartikel', 'Präverb' (*Vergl.*); disjunctive *neu-*: generally 'conjunction'.

a- (interr.) 'particle' (general usage; 'num' in *Vergl.* (index) is rightly corrected to 'interr.' in *Comp.*)

1.2 Research History

Monographic or comprehensive presentations and discussions of the elements in question are rare and as a rule non-systemic and non-structural (see below for individual research-historical accounts for the respective members of the category). Strachan 1909 par.92f. and Baudiš 1916 are the earliest to my knowledge; I find the latter (presented again in Baudiš 1933: 388) still one of the best yet in a very broad conception of 'preverbal particles' (the term used), with junctors, conjunctions and other elements included. Jones and Thomas 1977; 350ff. ('presentential particles', generativist model) is the source for most modern expositions of the system (Jones 1975/6: 337f., 1988: 162ff., 'preverbal particles'; Ball 1987/8, 'pre-sentential'), from which several important members are however exluded (*zero* for the responsive, relative *a-*, *y-* etc.). Wagner 1959 (e.g. 82, 162ff.) is as usual *sui generis* in conceiving of the elements categorially: his view is general-Celtic and typological. Howells 1967: 138ff. is another partial and catalogic

discussion of the 'particles', non-functional and mainly speculatively reconstructive ('particles specially employed...to keep the verb in "conjunct" flexion').

1.3 'Converter'

I use 'converter' in the sense of OED 'convert' (II–III, II 11c 'turn or change in character, nature, form or function' with III 15 'change by substituting something of equivalent value')—always in the sense of the structural tension existing between members of a paradigmatic opposition, i.e. the tension of commutability, and not dynamic transformability: converters are signals or syntactic status. Three descriptive-epistemological arguments speak in favour of adopting a new special term for this category. Firstly, this suits better a unified theory ensuing from a categorial analysis which defines a single paradigm (to replace a non-structural and often praeter-analytically conceived fragmentation of terms). Secondly, a fresh terminology could adequately present a new non-binary concept of syntactic marking, in this bypassing both the tyranny of the aprioristic morphology *vs.* syntax 'levels' model and the two paralysing dichotomies, not merely aprioristic and unanalytical but also properly speaking ungrammatical, of 'sub-' *vs.* 'superordination' (at best; usually 'main')[13] and 'dependence' *vs.* 'independence'. 'Dependence' could thus be freed for use in its structural (glossematic) sense of 'a type or grade of [inter-]relationship', and naïve, extraneous binomial hierarchy would be replaced by the signalled intricacies of texture and structure components in an analysis in terms of the system itself. Finally, the danger of pseudo-classification and the inadequacies, simplisticities, imprecisions, and sometimes downright misassociation of most loaded terms may be avoided.

Observations

1. My main objection to '(preverbal) particle' is that, like 'adverb', it is vague and fuzzy, a kind of descriptive 'white flag' pigeonhole for elements not otherwise definable of classifiable. Moreover, it is currently associated with a class of elements of special lexicogrammatical status, of attitudinal intersentential relators, typically with peculiar prosodic properties ('Abtönungs/Modal-partikel', W. *hagen*, *-ynteu*; cf. 'sentence particle' in Awbery 1984). Incidentally, converters are by no means exclusively 'preverbal" (they are pre-nexal). 'Pre-sentential' would certainly be unobjectionable on that count, but contains the vexed term 'sentence'.

2. 'Converter' has been brilliantly used (though not invented: the term goes back at least to Sweet's *New English Grammar* of 1900) by H. J. Polotsky, who virtually presented the first 'linguistic' description of Coptic on the basis of conversion phenomenology (to an extent this is equally true of pre-Coptic Egyptian), first in his *Coptic Conjugation System* (Polotsky 1960; see also the index to Polotsky 1970, and recently Polotsky 1987-90). Polotsky also used 'converter' for the Amharic nominalizer *yä-* (substantive/adjective status). Subsequently, a conversion system for Modern Greek has been postulated by N. Barri, a disciple of Polotsky's (Barri 1981, with a broader conception than mine for assigning 'preparticles' to such a system-central category and including circumstantial, conditional subordinators, substantivizers as well as tense-forming exponents). 'Conversion' has been applied to for Old Nubian grammar by Gerald M. Browne

[13] Consider the descriptive embarrassment implied in the Italian 'paraipotassi', on which see below (3.1).

(Browne 1982, see esp.21, and note the grouping into sentence and sentence-component converters). See (for Coptic and Demotic Egyptian) the present writer's 1986 (esp. Chapter 2 *passim*), 1988: 113-142, 194f. and 1989: 44-55. 'Conversion' is of course currently used for part-of-speech or word-class shift in word-formation study (originally Prague School usage: see Poldauf *apud* Vachek and Dubsky 1960: 23f.: 'la transformation d'une catégorie de mots [en une autre] à l'aide de moyens minimum').[14]

1.4 General linguistic implications

There are two theoretical general-linguistic implications of the categorial view here advocated—that is, apart from the obvious categorial distinctions themselves, the morpho-tagmemic phenomenology of syntactic-status signalling (comparable to the more general North-West European tagmemic inversion) and the immediate realization of the higher hierarchical standing of syntactic over 'morphological' resolution (the latter in fact turns out to be almost trivial).

(a) The cogency of clause dependency grammar within the descending analysis of the test is brought home to us by the untraditional view of Celtic grammar. This, in far-reaching analogy to nominal 'cases' ('clause-case'—'clause-prefix' grammar, in the sense of Ahlqvist's 'case-prefix grammar'), means observing several types and grades of dependence and doing away with 'absoluteness': no clause as part of the text (unless the text be metalinguistic, or text = clause) is absolute. (No case is, for that matter, absolute—the nominative no more than the accusative or genitive: all are held in a mesh of dependencies). These dependencies are in part mutually opposed, in part graded, some mutually or bilaterally, some unilaterally conditioned. By the same token, the simple social-hierarchy logics model of super- *vs.* sub-ordination fades away. Moreover, in a non-dynamic model no clause-form is 'more basic' than another: all share the same overhead paradigm and contain their own formal-and-functional specifics.

(b) Immediately ensuing from the above realization, the high-resolution view of conversion lets us gain an insight into the mechanism details of certain textemes and certain non-textemic complex subtextual unities. The dialogue is a striking case in point, with its resolution into formally determined, interdependent (and certainly not 'absolute') allocutive, performative and responsive/reactive subsystems; also, the precise definition of formally marked function roles, relationships and layers (or 'channels') within narrative texture. Converters are structured differently in dialogue and in narrative.[15]

Observation

Irish and Celtic in general have frequently been observed to 'resist' the traditional (universalistic, actually non-analytic and aprioristic) models of syntactic hierarchy.[16]

[14] R. Jakobson's 1957 'shifters' ('embrayeurs' and 'commutatori' in the respective French and Italian versions of his works) adapt O. Jespersen's very early term, and refer to elements that gear-shift a message according to pragmatic situation.

[15] Strikingly so in ModW: *zero- vs. fe-* in narrative, *zero vs. fe- vs. mi-* in dialogue: see below, 3.1.2.

[16] Cf. Lewy 1942 par.103, Lewy and Wagner 1967: 219f.; Hamp 1973 *passim* and esp. 238 (actually a review of OI clause dependence tagmemics). The structuring of inter-clause or subtextual dependence is also strikingly non-binary in Egyptian and Coptic. However, this 'exotic' quality of alienness is on second and third examination encountered in perfectly 'familiar' languages: see Fleischmann 1990: 189, 205ff. on Old French narrative (narrative texture in particular resists the binary hierarchy)—and I suspect that it is in fact the super-/sub-/co-ordination 'logical' model that is anomalous (if at all attested).

However, the '-ordination' borderlines have ever been fuzzy and their postulation highly ethnocentric and biased in orientation to 'clean' and reductionist models of logic of philosophy of language, themselves in turn geared to old and unquestioned preconceptions regarding a 'select club' of several background languages (Greek, Latin, English, German) and in fact extraneous to and uneasy in the actual structure of any language. The subsequent conforming of more 'exotic' systems to these models has always meant no more than that in these fields of observation, with the ethnocentric 'squint' and these harsh inaccurate heuristic tools, and given the complexity and delicacy of the opposition-systems involved, one will inevitably find what one is looking for.

2. *Clause-constituent functions*

2.0 *Category I: clause-constituent functions—nominalizing converters*

MW has two important affirmative clause-constituent conversion types, both nominalizing or rather substantivizing a verb form: they are definable and largely kept distinct by the nature of their substantivation nucleus, namely

a'$^{=}$: actantial (agent, object) substantivizing conversion and

y(d)-: nexus substantivizing conversion ('that' form). Both are endocentric, i.e. contain their own nucleus: *a-* is in syntactic terms a substantive occupying the 1st-2nd actantial slot within the valential verbal dependency scheme (e.g. 'he who', 'he whom'); *y-* a substantive outside the valential scheme, referring to the agent—verb dependence: '(the fact) that...'.

Observation

These substantivations are effected by converters, not by relative pronouns or conjunctions.[17] The high functional load of nominalizations in Welsh is obviously consistent with the functional importance of verbal nouns, and is a basic typological trait: Welsh is indeed a 'noun-grammar' language, in which nominals are central operators.[18]

2.1 *a'*$^{=}$*: actantial nominalizing conversion*

As suggested above, *a-* is a substantive, not an adjective; when in adnominal status (its 'relative' role), it is in fact in apposition with its nucleus. When 'antecedentless', i.e. in substantival syntactic status itself, it is not an ellipse of a (pro)nominal antecedent, but contains its own nucleus,[19] and occupies all substantival slots (i.e. is a member in all substantival paradigms):

object (PKM 86; in opposition to *y-*, see below);

existant (B 84f.);

[17] The diachronic transition from a 'relative pronoun' to a 'relative morph' (cf. Steinthal's 'nota relationis', for Coptic *et-* relative conversion form: Shisha-Halevy 1986: 18 & subject index) is known in Indo-European and non-Indo-European languages, e.g. in the transition from Middle to Late Egyptian. However, this relatively rare process should not be confused with the coexisting and fairly common 'relative' (in the sense of adnominal, attributive) role of 'that' forms.

[18] This again reminds one of the later phases of Egyptian before Coptic, *viz.* Late Egyptian and Demotic; Coptic in this respect largely returns to older phases of the language. To a lesser degree, this is typical to analytic phases of various European languages.

[19] Cf. Italian (non-interrogative) *chi*, French *qui/que* (see Tobler 1902:117ff.).

agent (P 596);
topicalized (PKM 61); topical, in complex nexus to a preceding actantial focus (in the Cleft Sentence (see 1.2);
thematized by *sef-* (PKM 56; in opposition to *y-*, see below)
presented: *llyna a-* (PKM 64; in opposition to *y-*, see below);
adnexal (ad-predicative) to a presented noun or pronoun, in the so-called Abnormal Sentence (see 2.3);
following prepositions (P 353; in opposition to *y-*, see below); and, of course,
adnominal, appositive to a noun (mostly definite), when it is conveniently considered to have a 'normal' attributive antecedent-with-relative pronoun construction: (P 23) *yr erchwys a ladyssei y carw* 'the pack which had killed the stag'.

Observation

The converter *a-* is as a rule zeroed before the prelexemic *ry-*, although *a-r-* is attested (no certain examples in our corpus: see Lewis 1942:xlviii f.; Simon Evans 1964 par.65 n.2)

2.1.1 Determination and specificity of the actantial nominalizer: (yr) (hwn) a-

These constructions are important insofar as they shed light on certain key questions of verbal noun signification, viz. the formal exponents of the nucleus, specificity scale markers, the role of verb tense and mood etc. We are here concerned with three constructions, *viz.* (a) *a-*, (b) *yr a* (*yr* viewed as article, not proposition), (c) *yr hwn a-*. In (a) and (c) two joint paradigmatic oppositions are observable:

opposition (2)	*yr*	|	|		
	yr hwn	| a	|		
	zero	|	|	indicative	} opposition (1)
		|	|	subjunctive	}

[opposition (1) is not functional in constructions (a) and (c).]

Anticipating the evidence below, one may define opp. (1) and (2) as establishing the category of specificity, on a ternary specifity scale:

zero- a- + *subjunctive* (lowest specificity: generic)
zero -a- + *indicative* (basic specificity: factive, actualized)
yr hwn a- + *indicative* (high specificity).[20]

(a) *yr a-*:

(1) pertinent: adverbial status ('quanto...', 'eo', 'the more...', 'however (much)...', 'insofar...' etc.; often concessive). In proposed or postposed status; always affirmative, with the main clause mostly negative; no resumption.

(P 63f.) *...na dyro, yr a ymbilio a thi* '...do not give (him another blow), however much he may plead with you'.

(P 489) *Yr a dywettei hi yn dec ac yn truan, ni chaffei namyn yr un atteb*' 'However much she might speak, fair or pitiful, she only got the same answer'.

[20] Cf. R.M. Jones 1975/6: 333.

(B 439f). *Ac yr a welsynt o ouut yn y guyd, ac yr a gewssynt e hun, ny doy gof udunt wy dim* 'And however much grief they had seen in their presence, and however much they themselves had suffered, no recollection came to them'. Also P 379, 381, PKM 70.

(2) Synchronically conditioned: *-r-* as 'glide' or hiatus-filler, following the preposition *o-* in the generic-partitive *o'r-a-* 'of that which', often with the generic subjunctive; occasionally with '*a-* + *subj.*' variant reading, e.g. P 504: P 56, 82, 186, 354, B 112, 179, 356 etc. etc.

Observation

1. In *ar ny* in P 127 (*ar ny del*, v.l. *ac ar ny del* 'whoever does not come') and PKM 50 ('*Ar ny deryw*... 'whatever has not been spent'), we have the demonstrative *ar-* (Simon Evams 1964: 70f.) as nucleus of the indefinite negative relative (see 2.4.2).

(b_1) *zero- a-* (+ subjunctive mood) generic and indefinite finite actantial verb substantivation, occurring in the following roles (in contradistinction to the actualized *zero- a-* + indicative (see P 120–1 for a neat syntagmatic opposition of the two), this determination grade does not occur as theme, yet does occur as existant):

(1) Topicalized:

(P 127) *a del yn waredawc*... 'whoever comes submissively'.

(B 293f.) *A uo penn bit pont* 'Whoever is chief, let him be bridge'.

(2) Existant:

(P 208) *A oes ohonawch i a adnappo*... 'Is there any of you who knows...? (also PKM 92, O 32).

(B 84f.) *Nyt oes it a wnelych*... 'There is nothing for you to do...'

(3) Object actant:

(P 120f.) *Keis a'th lado* 'Look for someone who might kill you'.

(4) Agent noun:

(P 596) *aet a'y mynho* 'Let whoever wishes (it) go'.

(5) 'Conjunctional' ('as'):

(PKM 82) ...*yn gyntaf a allont* 'as soon as they can'.

(b_2) *zero- a-* (+ indicative mood): factive, actualized, basic-specificity finite verbal nominalization, occurring in the following roles (in past or actual synchronous present time-reference):

(1) Topicalized:

(P 136f.) *A wnaethost...yrof i, Duw a'y talo itt* 'What you have done...for me, may God repay (it to) you'.

(PKM 61) *A geueis mi a'e crogaf* 'He whom I got, him I'll hang'.

(2) Thematic, presented:

(O 120f.) ...*hoffach oed genhyf a welun yno o aniweileit guyllt no thri chymeint a dywawt y gur* '...I thought more highly of what wild animals I saw there, than three times as much as the man (had) said'.

(PKM 64) *Llyna a mynhaf* 'Here's what I want'.

Note especially the use of [*a-* + indicative] in *sef-* constructions, to be treated in a forthcoming discussion. These are special cotext-bound thematizing patterns, with a special Communicative-Dynamism role in narrative texture, thematically resuming foregoing rhemes which are then cataphorically annexed to new rhemes:

(PKM 56) *Sef a wnaeth Riannon, edrych arnaw* 'What R. did was, look at him'.

(PKM 72) *Sef a gaussant yn eu kynghor aros*... 'What they decided in their council was, stay...'.

Observation

2. In focalization nexus patterns (Cleft Sentence and Abnormal Sentence, see below, 2.3.2), the specificity opposition between indicative and subjunctive does not obtain, the semantic opposition being different: the subjunctive expresses true modalities, e.g. 'optative' nuances, 'potential': (PKM 57) *Duw a dalho it; hynny a debyun i* 'May God repay you: this is what I supposed'; with (P 485f.) *Duw a wyr pob peth a wyr bot yn eu hynny arnaf i* 'God, who knows all things, knows this is a lie against me'. Incidentally, this illustrates the compatibility of the adnominal and thematic substantivation in different Immediate Constituents of a complex clause). Contrast (PKM 57) *Beth a wney di yma?* 'What are you doing here?' (PKM 58); *Pa-greft a gymery di arnat?* 'What craft will you take upon you?'; (PKM 59) *mi a'e gwn* 'I know it'. (PKM 64) *minheu a uenegeis yti pwy yw hi* 'As for me, I have told you who she is'.

(3) Object actant:

(P 120) ...*gwneuthur a wnaethum itt* '...to do what I have done to you'.

(P 330) *ny allaf ui arnaf a dywedy di uyth* 'I cannot ever bring myself to do what you say'.

(PKM 86) *Coffa a dywedeis wrthyt* 'Remember what I said to you'. Also PKM 63, 74, O 90.

(4) Governed by prepositions:

(P 353) ...*am a ercheist* '...as for what you have asked'.

(PKM 50) ...*wrth a dywedeisti* '...by what you said'.

(P 99) ...*amgen noc a uu* (sim. 249) '(not a single night, until the year's end, was) other than was (the first night)'.

(P 354) ...*cymaint ac a ercheist* '...as much as you have asked'.

(c) *yr hwn a-*, inanimate ('neutric') *yr hyn a-*, effectively only singular: high-specificity finite verbal nominalization. In contradistinction to *a-*, *yr hwn a-* phrases do not occur in focalization nexus (Cleft Sentence).

Observation

3. In *yr hwn a-*, the demonstrative is proclitic to *a-*, strictly speaking syntactically expanding the article *yr-* (it is properly speaking a demonstrative adjective) yet in effect modifying the substantivizing nucleus inherent in *a-*, of which *yr-* is but the analytic actualization.[21]

(1) Substantival—highly specific (with indicative); often topical:[22]

(PKM 75f.) *yr hwnn a uu ohonawch yn ewic yrllyned bit uaed coed yleni, a'r hwnn a uu garw ohonawch yr llyned, bit garnen eleni...yr un a uu uaed coet ohonawch yrllyned...bit vleidast eleni...* 'He of you who was a hind last year, let him be a wood boar this year...the one[23] who was a wood boar last year, let him be a she-wolf this year...'. Sim. O 816f.

(PKM 63) *yr hwnn a dyly, y grofy* 'the only (payment) it deserves, (namely) to be hanged'.

(P 546f.) *Yr hynn a oed ar y ben o wallt.* 'all hair that was on his head of hair'. For *yr hyn a-* 'all that', cf. also PKM 74 (*yr hyn a allaf i*: I.W.'s emendation, supplying a '*mi a'e gwnaf*' follow-up, is unnecessary), 87 (*yr hynn a dywedeisti*), O 99 (*yr hyn a geissy*). Also P 546f., PKM 68, O 299f.

[21] In our text, *yr hwnn* occurs rarely as an anaphoric representant of a high-specificity noun: (B437) *yr hwnn y tu a Chernyw* '(that door...) the one on the side of Cornwall'.

[22] See Sornicola 1988: 124ff. for the OI distinctions (*a* 'what', *inti, ani* 'he-who' etc.), in part absent in MW.

[23] For *yr un a-* 'the very one who..., cf. PKM 83, 84 with note; Simon Evans 1964:88; also 'a single one', P 515 etc.

(2) Appositive to high-specificity nouns (in effect to proper names, which do not normally occur as nucleus to attributive *a-* alone):[24]
(B 478f.) *paluawt Branwen, yr honn a uu tryded anuat paluawt yn yr ynys honn* '"Branwen's Slap", the one that was the third unfortunate slap in this Island'.

Observations

4. It is clear that in the Four Branches *yr hwn a-* is not yet a complex relative pronoun, as in later phases (see below). For the relative pronoun *yr hwn a-*, see Morgan 1952: 177ff. 'cymal perthynol cydradd' ('correlative'); Simon Evans 1964: 69 '(used) to introduce a non-defining clause' is objectionable, since it assumes once again the validity of a dichotomic logical *a-priori* distinction which is not reflected in the formal-and-functional grammatical phenomenology of Welsh. It is not the demonstrative alone that functions as 'relative pronoun' (*pace* Jones 1975/6: 340ff.), but the demonstrative with the converter as a complex 'pronominal relative marker' ('cyfosodiadol').

5. A typological note. The construction *yr hwn a-* is much discussed, with grammarians often pointing out its 'relative pronoun' status and its prevalence in translated MW, as a way of rendering gender-number characterized relative pronouns (Pedersen 1913: 216 Anm.; Morris-Jones 1913: 288, 297f.; Simon Evans 1964: 66, 69; Strachan 1909: 44; *GPC* 1930f. (3(a) and 1973 3(a), aptly listing its earliest attestation in a gloss, Juvencus (WB 156): *hirunn* gl. *quem*: see Lambert 1987: 288 (7), 291 (12), 292, also Lambert 1981 on the typological issues involved in the interface of latin and OI relatives). This still needs detailed investigation, including internal and contrastive analysis as well as the compilation of precise statistics,[25] and could well prove a means of establishing the 'translatedness' of a textual source. The construction appears especially typical of expositive and didactic-rhetorical-'paradigmatic' genres, and is not an automatic, mechanical rendering but meaningful, possibly signalling, with other formal features, an association with 'what has its source in latin'. On the other hand, *yr hwn a-* has a specific systemic value in Welsh, and certainly does not simply replace the relative converter *a-*, nor render every relative pronoun in the original. As has been stressed above, the conversion form *a-* is not a pronoun but a 'nota relationis', and does not carry any gender/number concord cohesive factor; the complex relative pronoun *yr hwn a-*, on the other hand, separates the 'flexional categories' and the syntactic status marking.[26]

6. The construction *yr hwn y(d)-* is attested three times in our corpus. (B 449) *Ysbydawt Uranwen a Matholwch oed yr honn yd aethpwyt e Ywerdon* (in parenthesis, in the 'narrator's channel') is difficult. Jones and Jones translate 'the Assembly of B. and M. was that wherewith they went to Ireland'; D. S. Thomson (see n., p.40) points out that the key word here is the obscure *ysbydawt*, according to which the meaning would be 'in/with/to which they went', see PKM 220f.). In any case, this is a clear instance of category (2) function. In

[24] See Shisha-Halevy 1989: 57ff., 65ff. etc.

[25] Some exx. from *Brut Dingestow*: I 10.11.11.14, II 1.3.6.12, III 9.10, IV 2.4.7; *Chwedlau Odo* 3.6.6.10.12; also frequently in *Ystorya de Carolo Magno* and of course Bible translations.

[26] A striking analogy may be seen in the Coptic 'relative' *nota relationis* converter *et-* and the development of a complex demonstrative-with-converter complex relative pronoun *pai/tai/nai et-*, also typical of translated language. This has been noted very early by the typologist H. Steinthal, in his edition of the posthumous Coptic grammar of M.G. Schwarze (Schwarze-Steinthal 1850: 496, also commenting on the same phenomenon in Semitic, Turkish and even a certain Slavonic dialect).

(PKM 54) *yr honn y mynnych* 'The one you wish' (specific again), *yr honn* replies to *pa-geluydyt* [P. Mac Cana suggests this may be a responsive ellipsis of (*inni uyned wrthi*)]; *y-* is not explicable by the attested valency of *mynnu*, and is difficult (zero 3rd pers. fem. infixed resumptive pronoun?) (PKM 79) *yr hunn yd wyt ti* is probably topical and adverbial, as well as rhematic (see 2.2): 'considering what you are, ...'. Consider Irish $a^{rel.}$-(+dep.) for 'all that...', formally coinciding with the 'indirect relative' construction (Welsh *y*-conversion).

2.2 y(d)-: nexus substantivizing conversion ('that'-nominalization)

Here, unlike *a-*, the specificity characterization is non-pertinent, the verbal nexus maximally actualizing the nominal.

Observations

1. Like *a-*, *y-* is zeroed before *ry-* (P 173f., 325), with some very rare *y-ry-* instances (PKM 11.1[?], 60.25); also before *oed* (see section 5, also for nominalizations of finite forms of <*bot*> 'be' in general).

2. The negator converter that is functionally most nearly coextensive with *y-* is *na(t)-*; see 2.4.1. It is remarkable, however, that the functional range of *na(t)-* is in our corpus considerably broader than that of its affirmative 'counterpart' *y-*: the latter does not occur appositively—to a noun lexeme (cf. PKM 70, 79 for *na-*), to the pron. theme *yw* etc., in the Nominal Sentence (PKM 80 for *na-*), rhematically, to *sef-* (PKM 69, *na-*). Other nominalizations, most notably the infinitive (with some agent characterization), supply these slots.

3. *Y-* and *neu-* (3.2) are the only converters which do not in our corpus condition mutation (*neu-* aspirates *c* in the older language: Morgan 1952: 364). This is synchronically remarkable, and may perhaps be correlated to the fact that their functional scope is the whole nexus and not any single constituent thereof.

4. On 'that' forms in Welsh (see also Obs.2 above).[27] In our MW we have, beside *y-* and, in a neat complementary distribution, *pan-* and *y mae/mai-* (below) for affirmative non-verbal-nexus nominalizing; also [i-AGENT + INFINITIVE] in its early phases as an '*i- cum infinitivo*' construction. The infinitive itself, with a prefixed or juxtaposed agent (pronominal or nominal, respectively), also *gan-* and *o-* marked instrumental agent is also used for nexus nominalization, with an especially important role of *bot* as carrier of the periphrastic conjugation, in various synt. statuses, sometimes in evident suppletion to *y-*: *...a menegi...uot y crydyon wedi duunaw* 'and told that the cobblers had joined together...' (PKM 58), *guedy mynet y baed a'r cun y'r gaer...* 'after the boar and the dogs went to the castle...' (PKM 55), *guedy y dyfot* 'after he came' (O 561f.). It is in appositive (B 240, 380, PKM 85, O 171f., 181f., 351f. etc.) and object-actant (PKM 85, 89–92, O 83f., 90f., 95 etc.) slots that we most clearly observe the use of infinitive (affirmative)/*na(t)-* (negative) in suppletion for *y-*:[28] Incidentally, here again the behaviour of *y mae* and *yd oed* is different (see 5 below).

[27] 'Welsh has no 'that'-like explicative conjunction' (Hamp 1973:232) is methodologically questionable, quite apart from the surely legitimate query of whether 'that' is in English a 'conjunction' at all or a converter-like status signal; I also doubt that 'explicative' is the best attribute to describe the functions of nexus substantivation, in Welsh or English.

[28] Illustration in grammars for the 'cymal enwol' is mostly late MW, Scripture idiom and Early ModW onwards: see Simon Evans 1964:171, Richards 1970: 138ff. However, we do find two rare instances of object *y-* in *Culhwch ac Olwen* 1089 *Mi a dywedaf... yd ymlad Arthur*, also (R, as a *varia lectio* W's infinitive) 782 cf. OW *it-*clauses glossing the Latin infinitive (Lambert 1987:298).

Non-verbal nexus is substantivized differently, and, in fact, this is one of the distinctive features of non-verbality: *may-* (O 199), *y mae-* (PKM 91); substantivizing a Cleft Sentence, alternation of *y may-* (actant focus, B 90f., 116) and *pan-yw-* (circumstant focus, B 115f., O 462f.). In ModW, *mai-* (*/taw*) are well established as nominalizing converters for non-verbal nexus of whatever rheme or focus, while (*i*-AGENT + (lenited) INFINITIVE], also [INFINITIVE + *i-* AGENT] is a true 'personal infinitive' increasingly concurring with *y-* 'that'-conversion,[29] with *i-* no longer a preposition but a formalized agent-'case' marker: *er taw iaith y nefoedd yw'r Gymraeg* 'although Welsh is the language of Heaven', *gobaith y gallai'r iaith fyw* 'hope that the Language can live', *gan mai gwneud pres fydd purpas y cwmniau masnachol* 'Since it is making money that is the purpose of the commercial companies', *rwy'n meddwl mai dyna wna' i* 'I think that that is what I'll do', *casglaf iddo farw ddechrau Hydref* 'I gather that he died at the beginning of October', *dyheu am i'r ymweliad ddod i ben ac i Catrin fynd* 'so that the visit might come to an end and that C. might leave', *y ffaith i'r Alfan Ellis ei hun fod yn ei thŷ hi* 'the fact that *the* Alfan Ellis himself was in her house'.[30]

(a) Adverbal, as object actant (the whole nexus is here actant, whereas *a-* forms are the actant constituent in the verb dependency phrase): this function is not attested in the Four Branches, the slot being filled by the infinitive (see Obs. 4 above).

(b) Thematic; presented:

(PKM 61) *...Llyma y gwelei*...'..., behold (that) he saw...': used for narrative highlighting superordination, following a temporal or circumstantial clause (also 71, 76, O 331 *nachaf y clywynt*, etc.). As a rule only 'see' and 'hear' (perception verbs) are attested. The same restriction, in the Four branches, applies to the nexus-thematizing *sef y-*... (see 2.1 for *sef a-*):

(B 344) *Sef y clywei arueu am benn hunnw* 'What he felt on that one's head was armour'.

(c) Existant (?)

(P 117) *Nyt ytt oydun yn holi dim it ti* 'It is not as if (lit. 'that') I was claiming anything of you'; one possible interpretation.

(d) Adnominal, satellital, in adverbial ('circumstant') or predicative dependence between nucleus and verbal nexus:

(1) expanding a noun, the adverbial ('adjunctal') nucleus of verbal expansion:

(B 105f.) *parth a'r lle yd oed Uendigeituran* 'towards the place where B. was'.

(P 462) *y nos y ganet* 'the night he was born'.

(PKM 85) *yr awr yd edrych* 'the moment she looked'.

(2) expanding a noun, the rhematic (predicative) nucleus of verbal expansion:

(P 230) *yr ynïwer y buam doe* 'the company we were yesterday'.[31]

[29] A term conventional for the Portuguese ('falarem' etc.; a phenomenon occurring elsewhere in Romance, in Sardic and some South Italian dialects) and very apt for the non-causative functions of Coptic *tre-f-sôtm*. The diachronic trend of Welsh, apparently inverse to that observable in Romance, from conjunctional to infinitival nexus substantivization, is probably no more than an 'optical illusion' and not a real diachronic sequence: the later, Romance linguistic phases did not evolve out of the *état de langue* represented by the literary corpus of classical Latin (Plautus, for instance, shows Romance features in this point too). This should certainly be borne in mind for Welsh.

[30] See Caerwyn Williams 1981. The postposition of the *i-* marked agent is diachronically instructive, ruling out metanalysis as a key factor for this construction (see 69ff.) In King 1993, this construction gets but a minimal mention (p.307), with the impression that it hardly exists in colloquial Welsh.

[31] This is not a 'nominative of apposition or accompaniment', but truly rhematic to *buam*, *pace* Howells 1966: 58f., and is hardly similar to (CA 1130) *o'r sawl a aytham* 'of as many as went (1st pl.)'. See Simon Evans 1950: 190.

(e) governed by prepositions

Apparently, a restricted list (other prepositions probably govern <*bot*> and other infinitives): *megis* 'as' (P 607), *mal-*, *ual-* 'as', 'like' (B 6, 26, 38, 343 etc.), *guedy* 'after' (O 792), *yn-* (B 372). Note especially *ac-* (P 94, B 395f., PKM 56f., 72, 88, 90 etc.) and *noc* 'than' (P 265, PKM 81, 87 etc.)

Observation

2. As topical nexus constituent in Cleft Sentence, *y-*, like *a-*, follows its focus-rheme, which is a member of the following paradigm:

adverbial, incl. noun in *status adverbialis* (PKM 61, 71f., 89).
infinitive (e.g. PKM 62)
predicative (rheme of converted verb, focus of complex clause (B 254, PKM 60)
adjective/adverb (P 616, O 313)[32]

2.3.1 Adnominal a- and y-: interrelations

The functional interrelation of 'that'- (nexus substantivation, 'general subordinator') and '*wh-*' (actant/circumstant substantivation, specific adnominal verb conversion, 'relative pronoun') forms, in adnominal status, constitutes a complex central issue in any language, regardless of genealogical or typological affiliation. Form/function delimitations are here invariably fuzzy or so complicated as to render this dichotomy more a matter of convenience than of basic descriptive significance. In European (and 'North-West-Europeanized') languages, we find 'that'-forms used with resumptive pronouns as analytical relatives, or without resumptives as 'conjunctional' relatives ('the day [that] he died'), alongside synthetic 'relative pronouns'; careful diachronic and synchronic observation points to the regular coexistence of both kinds of construction (occasionally with others, e.g. 'as', 'but' and *zero* in English). The negative system is usually different and must be treated separately (rel. *na(d)-* certainly spread, ousting *ny-*[1], in ModW; the functional range of *na(d)-* is broader than that of *y-*, in MW). Verb nominalizations have, at least potentially, different morphosyntactic properties in correlation with their semantics (nexus and manner nominalizations; factivity vs. non-factivity; prospectivity and modal semantics, and so on).[33]

Observation

Pertinent here is a central and one of the most-discussed issues of OI grammar, viz. that of the oppositions in distribution and functions of the so-called leniting and nasalizing relative clauses, which have sometimes been, in the comparative perspective, identified with Welsh *a-*

---

[32] This too belongs in the interesting 'predicative paradigm', of which the adjective/adverb part-of-speech neutralization is but one aspect. See Howells 1966: 55ff., Ahlqvist 1978: 33.

[33] Cf. Ahlqvist 1985: 328 with n.12. In Ahlqvist 1978: 77 n.14, the author draws attention to languages distinguishing different topicalization ('glose') forms in Cleft Sentence constructions for different (nominal or adverbial) foci. Such are the Egyptian-Coptic languages (see Shisha-Halevy 1986, Chapter 2; Polotsky 1971, see the subj. index under 'cleft sentence', also Polotsky 1987: 105ff.), yet these too show the difficulty of simple, neatly dichotomic statements in this connection: there are overlap ranges; gerundial ('circumstantial') and even *zero*-marked verbal topic forms also enter the paradigmatic picture (Cf. *zero* following adverbial foci in OI, Ahlqvist 1978: 70ff.). For the 'analytic relative'—'that' + resumption—see Rohlfs 1968 parr. 494, 496 for *che* in old Italian and Italian dialects; Jannaris 1968: 166f. for the history of Modern Greek *pou*, a 'looser' 'that' form occurring also in the adnominal role.

and *y-* clauses, respectively. Some basic discussions: McCone 1980, Ahlqvist 1985 (see esp. 332ff.), O'hUiginn 1986 (esp. p.79 for Welsh), Sornicola 1988 and 1989, Lambert 1992.

(a) *a-* with resumption of the antecedent: '*a-* for *y-*' (cf. Morgan 1952: 173). Note cases of compound actant, constituted by the appositive sequence of 'person + inalienable part'[34]: (B 422f. *y trydyd dyn a torres y galon* 'the third man whose heart broke' lit. 'who broke, his heart' (cf. *ibid.* 418f. *...a thorri ohonaw ynteu Gradawc y galon* '...and he broke, Cradawc, his heart', lit. 'and breaking by him...').[35]

(b) '*y-* used for *a-*', generally considered a 'prosodic-orthographical' phenomenon of variation,[36] should also be viewed from a syntactic angle. Indeed, we find *y-* in certain complex cases with the status of 'general subordinator', with a pronominal resumption, analytically realizing the object-actant role of the synthetic *a-*: (O 123) *Mawr y dywawt y gwr y mi y uot ef* 'Big the man told me he was'.[37] In the periphrastic verb forms, *y-* + resumption is obligatory: (O 409f.) *...a chanys vy lles i yd oedut ti yn y uenegi im* '...and since it is my good that you were telling me'. For (PKM 54) *yr hwn y mynnych* see above, 2.1.1, Obs. 6.

(c) Slots in which *a-* and *y-* both occur, with no apparent distribution factor or alternatively difference in value, are those following *no(c)* 'than' and 'conjunctional' *a(c)-* (O 156, v.l. *a-/y-*, or 'equative' adverbials (*yn gyntaf a-/y-*, PKM 82, O 161). Needless to say, also the zeroing before *ry-* brings about a neutralization factor: (P 325) *nog ry uuost ti*, (P 173) *y wrth ry-uuassei*. For the complementary distribution following the thematizing *sef-* (*y- gwelei/clywei // a wnaeth* etc.), see above.

2.3.2 The 'Abnormal Sentence' ('AS') and the Cleft ('Mixed') Sentence ('CS'): provisional notes

On this, no doubt the most vexed issue of MW grammar, I shall offer here no more than some jotted-down observations of the nature of 'work-notes', as a provisional preliminary sketch of a forthcoming detailed systematic study.

2.3.2.1 Formal and distributional characterization

The AS has the outward form of a focalizing complex-nexus pattern (see above, 1.2), in which a (pro)nominal or adverbial element, coreferent with the agent or with a circumstant of the verb, is followed respectively by *a'*[38] or *y(d)-* conversion of verbal nexus, constituting a relatively autonomous clause in dialogue or narrative with no focalization semantics apparent: indeed, in our corpus, the AS is on first sight the unmarked term of verbal predication.

The AS (in contradistinction to the CS) is affirmative only; in the # N/ADV + neg. nexus # patterns the verb is non-relative (but is converted nevertheless: 3.0.1), and the pattern's distribution and structural value are quite different. It is, among other considerations, the unwarranted identification of the so-called 'abnormal order' (*trefn annormal*) with 'abnormal

[34] Cf. Pedersen 1913 par. 544.8 and Lewis-Pedersen 1961 Suppl.12f.

[35] Cf. Taliesin (BT 59, 1.14) *A wei wedw y wreic* 'whose wife might be widowed', lit. 'who might be widowed, his wife'.

[36] See Lewis 1942: xxxviii; Morgan 1952: 173f.; Simon Evans 1964: 172f.; Richards 1970 par. 88 etc. 'Mistake' and 'confusion' (Poppe 1990: 45 and n.3, on *a-* following *ac*) seem hasty; see Simon Evans 1964: 63 N.3.

[37] In ModW, in the colloquial register: *Y Padraig hwnnw y saethodd Sean ef* 'The Padraig whom Sean shot'; *Dyna'r peth olaf y medrwn ni ei wneud* 'That's the last thing we can do' (Alun Jones) is obligatory.

[38] Not, however, *ysyd*: this is another formal distinction of the CS pattern.

sentence' (*y frawddeg annormal*) that leads to the assignment of # N/ADV + neg. nexus # as negative counterpart of the AS. However, *Wynteu hagen ni wybuyssynt i eisseu ef* '(He hadn't seen them for a long time; they, for their part, had known nothing of his missing' (P 142) or *...a chelu y damwein hwnnw ny allwyt* '...and they couldn't conceal this misfortune' are no AS cases, either formally or functionally, in the structural sense:# *ny-* + VERB # is common, unlike the affirmative (#*y* + VERB#) counterpart, and the noun-initial pattern is opposed to it. No distinctive suprasegmental data are available for the AS or CS; this is a crucial realization, in view of the orality feature of the corpus. No exhaustive distinctive component-constituency data, or respective precise macrosyntactic configuration patternings of the AS and CS have to date been presented. Current research has not been systematically concerned with the decoding of such formal specifics as are detectable, or indeed with the paradigmatic opposing of the AS and the CS, neither internally, i.e. in terms of constituency, nor macrosyntactically.

2.3.2.2 The Problematik. Current opinion and research history. Terminology

It is usually accepted that the verb constituent in the AS, unlike the CS, is rhematic, and the pattern is in Functional Sentence Perspective terms structured as 'theme to rheme'. Past and current research, richer on this than on any other issue in MW grammar, is clearly divisible into traditionalist (Morris-Jones 1913, Richards 1970, Simon Evans 1964 and so on), more diachronically oriented (Lewis 1946, Mac Cana, Arwyn Watkins) and synchronic (Mac Cana, Arwyn Watkins, Poppe, Fife). Monographic study is usually focused on the special constituent order, viz. nominal or adverbial preceding the verbal constituent—in typological-universalist jargon, 'SVO' (in the former case) and the summary and schematic conception of the syntactic phenomenon as 'fronting', (as if the converted status of 'V' in the AS were insignificant or trivial, or as if such schematically condensed word-order features were at all meaningful out of opposition with 'VS' cases (what about '*y mae* N *yn* + INFINITIVE'?)—as evolving or diverging in time (again, as if ModW *états de langue* really evolved simply from our MW corpuses, which evolved out of what we have of OW—cf. the 'Romance out of Classical Latin' diachrony fallacy)[39]—or as deviating from a postulated 'normal' and yet (for affirmative, indicative verbal nexus) extremely rare 'verb-initial' ('VSO') order. This approach to the question is of course reflected in the term 'AS' itself; and yet—synchronically speaking—statistics alone carry, or ought to carry, little weight in the structural resolving of a *système de valeur*.[40] Far better as a characterization term is 'unmarked' (e.g. Mac Cana 1979: 180), although this too is contestable and must eventually be qualified; in the intertextual sense, the AS is 'marked', signalling a literary genre.

Apart from the constituent-order issue, which I consider to be basically descriptive or even definitive, a *petitio principii*, hardly a functional definition of the pattern functionally,[41] the synchronic main points debated in the literature on the issue[42] concern (a) the identity of the

[39] See Mac Cana 1991, esp.53f., for cogent words on the problematic nature of arguing from OW, from poetic texts, from Continental Celtic. I wholly concur with Mac Cana's unambiguous statements of scepticism (Mac Cana *l.c.*, also 1979: 186f.) regarding the comparison of OW and MW.

[40] Cf. Poppe 1990a: 44f. 'the statistically 'normal' word order ... is 'abnormal', at least in current grammatical terminology, but also when compared to the dominant verb-initial order VSO in Old and Modern Welsh'.

[41] I consider here apt and cogent Coseriu's objections, in 'Partikeln und Sprachtypus: Wege zur Universalienforschung', in *Festschrift H.J. Seiler*, Tübingen 1980 199-206, see p.202 n.10.

[42] I shall not quote here the numerous past treatments of the AS exhaustively or in any detail; let me select for mention some special discussions which I consider central: Simon Evans 1968; Mac Cana 1973, 1979, reaffirmed in 1991; Arwyn Watkins 1977/8, 1987, 1988; Poppe 1989/90, 1990a, 1990b and 1991; Rowlands 1980, 1982; Fife 1988.

'preverbal particle' in the AS: this is often treated as different from, though homonymous with, the 'relative' *a-/y-*.[43] Note that the respective distributions of the 'real relative' and the 'pseudo-relative' morphs certainly do not warrant a strict statement of homonymity; there is thus no syntactic case against considering the AS as including a relative conversion. (b) The functional status of the initial constituent of the AS as a case of topicalization (stated in various terms, from 'nominativus pendens' to 'topic construction', by most scholars; 'fronting', the term most in vogue, is schematic and essentially dynamic), e.g. Fife 1988, Poppe 1990a: 54. I find it difficult to accept the simple topicalization role assigned as the functional specific of the AS as synchronically meaningful; indeed, such statement is almost tautological, or trivial and begging the question, unless 'topic' be understood in the sense of cotext-bound extraposed or 'isolated' (Bally's 'segmented') element.[44] However, in this proper or restricted sense of 'topic', many or most of the instances of the AS will not stand the simple test of cotextual semantics: they are not topicalizations, but clauses unmarked for any kind of constituent prominence (see Obs.1 below). (c) The resolution of formal/functional differential specifics between the AS and CS. The principle, at least apparently prescriptive, according to which the CS differs from the AS in its lack of pronominal/verb syntagm concord, a condition obviously only applicable in the case of interlocutive pronouns, conflicts often with the facts.[45] Functional—and practical—identification is not always easy (once again, circularity is a constant danger); it is nevertheless usually possible, if one keeps carefully to textemic resolution and constituency factors.[46] Past research (including the monographic Fife 1988, on which more below) has not really confronted the AS and CS paradigmatically, nor investigated distinctive time-reference of occurring tenses, nor defined and separated in the treatment environmental macrosyntactic patternings or textemes and other subsets (e.g. dialogic and subdialogic, narrative and subnarrative, expositive systems, interlocutive and delocutive[47]; Mac Cana and Arwyn Watkins do, in general terms, stress the difference between dialogue and narrative; cf. Mac Cana 1979: 183f.). It is, as I said, often possible to distinguish the unconverted, i.e. affirmative, non-interrogative,[48] unincluded instances of CS from the AS. For instance: in dialogue (including the 'narrator's channel'), infinitives and predicative nouns in the 'adverbial' slot (in the case of # ADV. + *y-* VERB #) characterize the CS, not the AS; so do indeed many prepositions and indeed most adverbials: *o achaws* (B 473f.), *truy* (B 325), *urth* (PKM 58), *y ueis* (B 253) and so on. So do, in narrative and dialogue, typically thematic verb lexemes, such as *mynet* and *dyuot* 'go', 'come': *Y gyscu yd aethant* lit. 'To sleep they went' (P 146), *...ac y'r llys y deuthant yn dangneusus* 'To the court they went, peacefully' (P 125), or *Eirchat wyf a'm neges a wnaf* (P 314f.) 'I am a suppliant, and it is my

[43] So for instance Lewis 1946:117f., see below; in R.L. Thomson's words (*Pwyll* xxiv) ... 'the particle a-, identical in form and mutation with the direct relative particle... the particle *y*, *yd* identical in form with the oblique relative particle...'.

[44] For topicalization in this sense, see Mac Coisdealbha 1977, esp.37; Sornicola 1988: 124-131; Henry 1960: 111-124 for French, Satzinger 1976: 7-82, for Late Egyptian. On a higher, macrosyntactic level, one clause may be topical to another: typically, a conditional or temporal protasis is topical to its apodosis (Satzinger, *l.c.*), which is thus rhematic; or even a question to its response (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1981: 136ff.).

[45] There are many exceptions, and it is too easy to fall here into the circularity trap: see (*i.a.* Pedersen 1913: 236ff., Simon Evans 1964: 180, 1968: 313ff.; B 294 *Mi(ui) a uydaf pont* is at least arguably a CS: '*I* will be bridge'.

[46] Arwyn Watkins 1988 is a good descriptive account, correlating the AS or CS respectively with actantial status of (pro)nominals under consideration of 'discourse categories'.

[47] A precise investigation of temporal values of the aorist may be rewarding in this context; also correlation of FSP specifics with persons and phoricity.

[48] Interrogative pronouns or adverbs are inherently focal and enter the CS construction; the *ny-t-* allomorph of the neg. converter negates all types of non-verbal nexus; similarly, the *o-s-* allomorph of the conditional junctor.

business that I do'. Similarly, the infinitive-focus Cleft sentence with topical *gwneuthur*, *passim*. In the # (PRO)NOUN *a-* VERB # pattern the case is basically different: cf. narrative *ef a doeth* 'He went' (B 41, PKM 84), *a'y wreic a aeth attaw* '...and his wife came to him' (P 147f.) or dialogic *mi(nheu) a af* (B 40; *minheu* marking topical or focal prominence); *Trannoetth tirionwch ac ymdidan hygar a uu y ryngthunt* (P 96f.). (d) The stylistic statement, describing the AS as a conventionalized 'literary device' (e.g. MacCana, e.g. 1977: 14f.) is on the one hand unescapable; on the other hand, when one reflects that this is no less than the pattern of the 'normal independent sentence in written Middle Welsh' (Arwyn Watkins 1990: 256)—and a clause pattern that is in unmistakable opposition to several other clause forms—one realizes that the stylistic marking of the pattern must be part of its overall functional load.

Observations

1. I single out Fife's monograph (Fife 1988)[49] for detailed attention, as it is the only book-length treatment of the AS/CS issue. The work merits a full review, and summary criticism may seem unfair; I shall therefore but observe on several points and formulations which I believe call for critical reaction. Indications of faulty method, circular argumentation, statements trivial or begging the question, ill-defined or dubious terminology, even downright errors abound; consider 'making *y mab* the topic of the sentence gives it added prominence', 98; or 'treating the AS as a topicalization explains the fronted position of the focused item', 106 (note also 'topic' here and elsewhere, apparently used as synomymous with 'focus'; so too in '...the ubiquitous tendency to topicalize the focus of a question' [100], a self-contradictory terminological conundrum if there ever was one); 'grammar is influenced by pragmatic and semantic factors', 85: 'grammar' is integrated with the pragmatic context; semantic content is a basic constituent of the linguistic sign, semantic context part of the environment in which it is decoded. As I have suggested above, characterizing the word-order in the AS as 'deviant' or as 'overriding the basic syntactical pattern' is unhelpful and meaningless in synchronic description. Formal features presented (112f.f.) as distinctive are in fact basically descriptive, tautological or a *petitio principii*. Thus, the AS is not nominalized because it is a pattern (see below) that is unconvertible; the same accounts for the fact it is not 'subordinated'; it is not nexally negated[50] since, in Fife's own words (114f.), 'the asserted content is the whole clause'. I must most definitely take exception to Fife's use of 'topic(alization)', which is universalistic (see for instance 95, 109 and often; Fife's theoretical orientation is apparently 'functional'-generative/transformativist-universalistic), blurred (see for instance the quotations above from 98 and 106), and so broad as to trivialize any distinction between topic and theme (see the terminological glossary below, also Shisha-Halevy 1986: 70ff.). For instance, 'a classical function of the topic is to set the theme for the following comment... [or to name] the entity about

[49] J. Fife and G. King's recent paper ('Abnormal Sentence: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective', in: Fife and Poppe (eds.), 1991, 81–153) repeats in essence Fife 1988, with some reformulations and expansions. I shall therefore not refer to it in detail. It is worth 'observing, however, that the authors' conception and definition of 'topic' is still so broad as to be trivial (see esp. pp.122ff.; e.g. 123 topics 'set theme of sentence'—no-one has ever contested the fact that the nominal first term of the AS is thematic!), also the trivialization of 'focus' to cover all instances of prominence, even topical (95; thus, in many cases focus = topic = theme!). The AS and CS cannot be, even *a priori*, 'similar in structure, but differing...in interpretation and syntactic behaviour' (92f.), but 'different in structure', which would imply 'different syntactic behaviour' and equal 'different interpretation'.

[50] It is not the case that, as Fife says (114), in the CS 'the main assertion, namely the copula' is negated; what is negated is the focus—topic nexus (through its formal exponent, viz. *-t-*).

which the rest of the clause comments...' (99), and to level and virtually nullify the prominence markedness value of the topic, as well as its cohesive role: not every phenomenon of cohesion—or its cancelling—is topical (see 103f.). In point of fact, a careful study of Fife's exx. for the AS reveals that their nominal element[51] is either not topical at all (e.g. PKM 1.1, 8.28, 26.27f., 70.1, 78.3f., 84.3; esp. cases of the simple pronouns, like *Mi a wnaf...Mi a brynaf...*, P 38f.),[52] or with other topic-signalling factors involved: notably the so-called 'conjunctive' pronouns, in reality lexemic independent pronouns, in certain definable circumstances, esp. interlocutives and main clauses;[53] or *hagen*.

2. The sentence particle *hagen*, among other formal cotextual and clause-internal means, seems sometimes, esp. in dialogue, to signal or co-signal topicalization. The particle occurs following and demarcating topicalized nominals or pronouns: *Y mab hagen a gymeraf i* 'The child I will take' (PKM 75); *Wynteu hagen ni wybuyssynt i eisseu ef* '(He hadn't seen them for a long time) they, for their part, had known nothing of his missing' (P 142); *Yr a rodwn i idaw ef hagen* 'The more (blows) I give him, he would fight as well as before' (P 64); and even after topicalized nexus: *Ony'm llad i Duw hagen, nit hawd wy llad i* 'Unless God kill me, it is not easy to kill me' (PKM 86).[54] However, *hagen* follows not only topical and thematic segments of complex clauses but also, in CS and Nominal Sentence, the focus/rheme, e.g. preceding *yw* (*Culhwch ac Olwen* 11, 868f., 880, 899, 1027); or following the entire rheme + theme sequence (*Culhwch* 18); in (PKM 90) *ny welsei neb ar wr dremynt druanach hagen noc a oed arnaw ef* 'No one had ever seen on a man a sight more pitiful / *hagen* / than there was on him', where the particle seems to close a rhematic constituent. In fact, *hagen* seems to have (beside any intersentential relator function) a thematic structuring role within its clause. (Its meaning is given in *GPC* as 'but', 'however', 'besides', 'indeed', a 'semantic mix' often indicative of information structuring functions; cf. the usual semantic definition of Ancience Greek *de* and *gar*). It marks the seam (or 'caesura') between the thematic and rhematic constituents, with an occasional prominencing effect. In narrative, this role is less pronounced (cf. for instance P 268). It should be noted that it is not possible to use the placement of *hagen* as indicative of a distinctive prosodic structuring of the AS and CS. For *hagen* is a delimitation signal: it delimits (and 'locks') and probably defines the functionally basic informative-syntactical constituent units, apparently regardless of their prosodic nature (or does it lend them single-colon status?)[55]

2.3.2.3 The 'Abnormal Sentence'—essentially and formally presentative

I believe the AS is in form a presented-nexus pattern: # zero presentative + verbal nexus #. Like its constituents, an entire nexus may, on a high subtextual level of analysis, be queried, negated, focused, presented as existant or as situation-explicative. In this sense, the entire 'AS' clause is—on the same higher level—rhematic, with a situational (pragmatic) zero (existential)

[51] Fife hardly discusses the 'ADV + *y-* VERB' type of AS.

[52] Cases of topic outside and preceding the AS are instructive and common: P 336 (*amdanaf inheu* + AS), P 355 (*am*), 74 (*tithau* + AS; 0 399 (nom. topic + AS). It is surely unnecessary to point out the danger of circular argumentation and arbitrariness imminent in the categorial identification of AS with this watered-down conception of topicalization.

[53] Note in this context the delocutive *ynteu* followed by a proper name (e.g. PKM 8, 21, 25, 67, 74, 78, 82 etc).

[54] Cf. also *Culhwch ac Olwen* 1033 *Ny chauas dim hagen namyn...*

[55] See Shisha-Halevy 1986 Chapter 6, for comparable Coptic phenomena. The particle *ynteu* (comparable with Coptic *ntof*, also a homonymic pairing of 3rd-masc.-sgl. pronoun and sentence particle) is different in that it is truly enclitic, following strictly closed prosodic units: cf. PKM 9, 15, 16, 18.

theme.; on a lower Immediate Constituents level, this rheme is further analyzable as [theme + rheme]. Originally perhaps a combination of existential situation-presenting, situation-explicative and expressive oral-language syntax,[56] a main carrier of a dramatic enactment of the oral narrative, this construction indeed underwent in time 'demarking', devaluation of the dramatic factor and functional reassignment as a literary stylistic characteristic—in our corpus, the AS is the unmarked term of affirmative verbal predication in dialogue as well as narrative. (Let us however bear in mind that we have no data on the respective suprasegmentals of the AS and CS, which, in a text which was in all probability meant for oral encoding and auditive decoding, is a serious and perhaps crucial handicap.)

Observations

1. Compare, for narrative presented nexus, French narrative presentative clauses[57] such as 'C'est Jean qui a été surpris!' 'A ce moment, voilà Marie qui se met a pleurer'—'Dès que l'alarme fut donnée, voilà le voleur que s'enfuit'; also, as in MW, with zero (existential?) presentatives: 'Dans l'aire une balle qui siffle'—'Une procession de brahmanes que se dirige de ce côté'. All this, beside explicit situation-presenting dialogic cases of existentially presented rhematic nexus, like: 'Maman, il y a ma poupée qui s'est cassée!'—'Attention, il y a la vase qui va tomber!',[58] or situation-explicative cases: 'Ce n'est rien: c'est une femme qui se noie'; 'Je dois rentrer maintenant'—'Pourquoi?'—'Il y a quelqu'un qui vient dîner'. As in Modern Irish (n56), we also find exclamative-affective situation-descriptive cases, in narrative: 'C'est Jean qui a été surpris!', or dialogue: 'C'est toi que regretteras la mer!'.[59] Admittedly, presentative nexus is essentially dialogic; but narration—and certainly our type of narrative—is after all no less a case of locutive 'oral discourse' than other locutive textemes.

2. A presentative situation-explicative value with a 'pragmatic theme' (linguistically zero)—from 'the situation is...' on—was first illustrated for the MW AS in some of Mac Cana's exx. for the 'fronted nominal' pattern (in Mac Cana 1973, see 1991: 64f.), and earlier in Lewis 1946: 118f., in a by now famous example—'the Twm Jones Story' (Mac Cana 1991: 45ff.) '*Twm Jones rows ergyd iddo fe*', in another register '*Twm Jones roth glec iddo-fo*') ('The situation background is that)[60] Tom Jones gave him a slap', which is nicely parallelled in the

[56] Cf. the exclamative CS in Irish, in affective narrative (incl. personal narrative) description of high personal involvement (ModI exx. from Peig Sayers, Ó Flaithearta, Ó Laoghaire): *Is mise a bhí go cráite!* 'Was I tormented!'; *Nach ar mo mháthair a bhían ghlondar!* 'Was my mother glad!' (or: 'Wasn't my mother glad!') *Nárb é an teach a bhí folamh ina dhiaidh, agus nárbh í a d'éirigh aosta o shin?* 'Wasn't the house empty after him, and hasn't she grown old since?' *Nocht sé a fhiacla thíos agus thuas, agus is iad a bhí go dhíite ar a chéile* 'He bared his teeth, down and up, and were they packed close together!' Cf. Henry 1978:43 (on exclamative 'Nach ann atá an t-uisce!'): 'the element immediately following the copula tends to monopolize the stress which logically belongs to the whole clause'.

[57] See Rothenberg 1971, esp. 104ff., 108ff. also *ead.* in *BSL* 67 (1972) 175-213; all French exx. are quoted from these studies.

[58] When M. Harris (1986:199; also elsewhere) suggests that '*Il y a le téléphone qui sonne*' is in some way equivalent to *le téléphone sonne*, he clearly misses the functional point, as well as creating pseudo-problems, viz. 'whether this *qui* is truly a 'relative'...or whether it can plausibly be viewed as a variant of the unmarked subordinator (which is, however, normally *que*)'.

[59] For Italian cf. the following: *Non durava a lungo: ecco che già s'alzava, ecco che usciva dalla tenda...* (shift in narrative pace); *Un ramo, da dorato, diventa addirittura incandescente: è l'incendio che si propaga agli alberi* (descriptive narrative); *È che io, ecco, sono arrivato ora... per vendicare mio padre* (explanatory 1st-person narrative)—all exx. from Italo Calvino.

[60] The apocritic-explicative role of the presentative 'pseudo-CS' is very prominent in Welsh and attested in Irish. In our corpus, consider P 46f., P 472f., PKM 74; ModW (Dafydd Parry, Daniel Owen): explaining a sudden change of mood, *'Rhyw ysfa ryfeddol sydd wedi gafael ynof i'* 'Some strange craving has taken hold of me'; explaining a late appearance at work, *'Y cloc-larwm'cw ddaru stopio yn y nos* 'That wretched alarm-clock happened to stop in the night'.

French 'C'est maman qui me bat' (following the question 'Why are you crying?', directed to a little girl). This sentence features in Rowlands 1980: 222 (as the AS 'in reply formats') and recently in Fife 1988: 159f. (n.20). While Fife is quite correct in stating that the entire answer is new information, Fife, as at the time Lewis, completely ignores the implications of the specific apocritic-explicative function of this case,[61] viz. first, that this is no semantically unmarked case;[62] second, that formally speaking it is well possible that all 'AS' instances are similar rhematic-nexus patterns. The 'explanatory' role isolated by Mac Cana in 1973 for the CS/AS structures and adopted since generally (e.g. by Rowlands and T. Arwyn Watkins) is, I suggest, not merely a functional but also a formal statement—a different structure different from that of the polemic—antithetical nominal/adverbial focus Cleft Sentence.[63] Schematically (e.g. in French, Coptic, Egyptian):

(a) *'it' (PRON.THEME)* + [is] + FOCUS-RHEME + *SUBSTANTIVAL VERBAL NEXUS*

with the formal pronominal theme ('it') endophoric (cataphoric) to the nominal verb-form, which in turn is appositive to it (Damourette-Pichon's *glose*)—thus fully thematic or topical—and not adnominal to the rheme. This is the Cleft Sentence, a focalizing construction;

(b) *'it' (PRON.THEME)* + [is] + TOPIC-THEME + *ADJECTIVAL VERBAL NEXUS*

with the formal pronominal theme ('it') esophoric (referring, often as explanation or background-giving, to a contextual or cotextual 'situation'). The verbal nexus is both expanding (satellital) and rhematic ('predicative') to the substantival or pronominal (or adverbial) topic; this is the presentative construction. (See in detail Rothenberg 1971 for French; Shisha-Halevy 1987: 172ff. for Coptic and Egyptian). In the MW correspondents, of course, we have no pronominal theme nor, in the affirmative non-interrogative Cleft Sentence, 'is' (copula): nevertheless, the two main constituents interrelate in two different kinds of syntactic dependence.

My argument is, quite simply, that, since a formal differentiation has been identified and accepted for certain languages with CS structures (nominal + relative, less commonly 'adverbial' i.e. circumstantial finite verb forms), between (a) a focalizing and (b) a nexus-presenting pattern, it would be worth considering whether the 'tormented' issue of the apparent (at any rate, pre-analytic) formal coincidence or overlap in MW of a focus-initial and topic-initial construction could not find its solution in a similar distinction.

3. The pragmatic theme of the presented nexus ('the case/situation is, that...') is *zero* in an autonomous utterance. However, we find it actualized as a non-zero allomorph, after the junctor *o-* 'if' (4.2.) in *ony-t-* 'unless': (P 287) ...*onyt ti a'm gwrthyt* '...unless you refuse me', (B 34f.) ...*onyt y neges a geif* '...unless he achieve his errand'.

[61] On the one hand Lewis states (1946:117f.) that in the AS *a-* is not a relative ('Addurn ydyw, a lusgwyd i mewn...drwy gydweddiad...rhoed *a* i mewn yn [pattern 1: 'Gwyr cyrchassant'] heb amharu dim ar ei hystyr...Ffurf lenyddol addurniadol ydyw'); on the other hand, he illustrates the AS in the very special pragmatic context calling for the apocritic presentative, with the situation thematic (118f.). Cf. Mac Cana 1991: 70 '[fronting + relativization cases] all relate or react to a question, statement, directive or simply a situation that has been expressed, described or implied in the preceding text'.

[62] Mac Cana's basic contention in Mac Cana 1973, 1991.

[63] Thus, I believe T. Arwyn Watkins' statement ('The Function of Cleft and Non-Cleft Constituent Orders in Modern Welsh', in Fife & Poppe, edd., 1991 329-351, see p.341) to the effect that 'Cleft is also optional in the realization of explanatory declaratives' (see also p.331) misses the formal point: we are not dealing here at all with a 'Cleft'.]

4. In the narrative-initial, interepisode and episode-initial narrative-texture slots, where most elements are treated as *prius nota* when very few are actually given as *prius dicta*, I suggest that we find another 'live' type of the presentative sentence, not an 'unmarked' narrative AS (nor a *mise en relief* CS): (P1) *Pwyll Pendeuic Dyuet a oed yn arglwyd ar seith cantref Dyuet* 'Pwyll Prince of Dyfed was Lord over seven cantrevs of Dyfed'.[64]

5. In (P 77f.) *Ef a doeth makwyueit a queisson ieueinc y diarchenu* 'There came lads and young servants to disrobe him', *ef* is the formal subject to maintain the sentence-second position of the verb, while the whole *Ef a doeth* is thematic to the rest. Similarly, P 120 etc.

2.3.2.4 The MW Cleft Sentence: low focality

An essential factor in the study of the patterns in point is that the focalization semantics considered for the CS formal type, crucial and constantly applied for resolving the CS/AS ambiguity and defining their functional specifics, are implicitly (a) English-orientated, (b) focused on a relatively simple antithetical-'polemic' conception of emphasis. In fact, however, the focality value of CS-type constructions greatly varies in different languages (and even in different varieties, especially registers, of one and the same language), its 'emphasis value' ranging from relatively high (as in standard literary British English) to low and very low (as in types of colloquial French). In MW, it seems the average 'prominence factor' of the construction is much lower than in the corresponding pattern in the English most linguists have in mind. I see the following as narrative CS instances, not normally to be so rendered in the variety of English used here: (P 461f.) *Mab a anet idaw ef ac yn Arberth y ganet* 'A son was born to him, and in Arberth was he born' (O 651f.) *Y myun y doethant* 'In they went...', (P 600f.) *Y'r yneuad yd aethont ac y ymolchi* 'They went to the Hall and to wash' (P 585f.), ...*ac ar y kynghor hunnw y trigyssant* '...and in that counsel they remained', (PKM 73) ...*eu harglwyd a gollyssynt* '...they lost their lord', (PKM 82) *Duw a dalho ywch* 'May God repay you'.[65] These last examples illustrate the difficulty and ever-imminent circularity of identifying a clause constituent as thematic or rhematic. A forced or uneasy translation of an instance is therefore no cogent argument against a CS analysis, any more than a natural and felicitous translation into English is an argument for it;[66] the specific Welsh value can only be determined internally, by opposition with other clause types. A second consideration, no less important,[67] is that the semantic range of the CS (and presentative) patterns is broad, and the polemic kind of emphasis occupies but a narrow range in it, in correlation with specific argumentative cotextual configurations. Others (beside the presentative functions discussed above) are for instance the narrative-chronicling (P 461f.), or the narrator's channel for extranarrative information (P 544f., B 473f., PKM 92), or the 'omniscient narrator's' information (PKM 77f., 85).

[64] See Mac Cana 1973: 106ff., 1991: 70f; cf. Shisha-Halevy 1987: 172ff., for Coptic.

[65] Cf. Mac Cana 1991: 63f.

[66] Incidentally, the value of the Egyptian-Coptic CS is on the average closer to the Welsh (and French) one than it is to English varieties: see Shisha-Halevy 1986: 85, 1987: 172ff.

[67] This is part of Mac Cana's main point (in Mac Cana 1973, 1991), namely that the pattern found in many different textual roles is not the 'unmarked' AS. However, I hold that we face here more than just 'rich and subtle variety of emphatic nuance' (1991:45), or 'subtle emphasis and expressiveness' (*ibid.*77), but a variety of patterns—both macro- and micro-syntactic—with different analyses. Moreover, I believe it is undesirable to mix formal and functional characterizations, as in (*ibid.*65) 'marked [*funct.*]' relativized [*form.*] non-contrastive [*funct.*] fronting [*form.*]'.

2.4 Clause-constituent negators

As has been pointed out above, it is important to bear in mind the asymmetry (more striking in MW than in Old and Middle Irish) of the affirmative and negative conversion systems: the negative conversions here discussed (see also below, 3.0.1) are not correspondent by-forms of affirmative ones, although such matching may be proposed as a matter of convenient approximation.[68] By and large, the negative system is somewhat poorer in conversion distinctions.

2.4.1 na(t)'

Unlike its ModW descendant, *na(t)'* does not occur in our corpus adnominally to an actant or as actant substantivation, nor does it occur as circumstant substantivation—roles of affirmative *a-* and *y-*, respectively, see 2.1.2 above. It does occur as negative nexus substantivation ('that not'), appositively to *yw* and to lexemes, as their 'contentualization' (the functional scope of its affirmative 'counterpart' *y-* is more restricted: see 2.2). It has two allomorphs, *na(t)-* + verbal nexus and *na-t-* + delocutive noun-rheme and focalization nexus.

Observations

1. It appears that in earlier phases of the language, *na(t)-* may have had substantival actantial roles: consider the famous *yssit na-s-geffy* 'there is that which you shall not get' (although the analysis as existential nexus substantivization, lit. 'there is that you shall not get it', is still possible) varying with *yssit ny cheffych*, in *Culhwch ac Olwen*, where (generic) negative object-actant substantivation is affirmatively stated as existant: note that an infixed object-pronoun, resumptive of the inbuilt nucleus, is obligatory with *na-* (thereby proving it an adnominal 'that' form?), but not with *ny-*, '(that) which'. Also, consider the OW gloss *nat-oid-guocelesetic* on *(nulla) titillata* (Lambert 1987: 302).

2. There occur in our corpus two not entirely conclusive instances of 'that'-form *ny-* (both *nyt-*): (PKM 80) *Dywedwch idaw nit a ymi un o'r esgideu hynn* 'Tell him—not one of these shoes fits me' (or; 'Tell him that...'); (PKM 62) *Gwir yw, Arglwyd, nyt gwerth arnaw ef dim* 'It's true, Lord: he is worthless' (or: 'It's true that...'). In the solemn asseveration *Dioer ni-* (e.g. P 487, B 81, 92, 99, O 26 etc.) we have either a different—archaic—syntax, with *ny-* truly adverbal: 'God knows that...not'; or, more probably, no synchronic 'know' and no inclusion: 'By God, ...'; cf. *Duw a wyr na-* 'God knows that...not', e.g. O 295f.

3. 'Relative' *na(d)-* and *ni(d)-* are usually said to coexist in ModW (see, for instance, Williams 1980: 51ff.). On the impressionistic basis of several novels (by Kate Roberts, Islwyn Ffowc Elis, Alun Jones) and of textbook illustration, I find that *na(d)-* (also with postnegators) alone is the converter used, with pronominal (e.g. *ef na fu erioed mewn car* 'he, who was never in a car'), definite or indefinite nominal antecedents, for actantial (both 'direct' and 'oblique') and circumstantial ('adverbial') adnominal expansion, as well as topically (in Cleft Sentences); two rather special examples of ad-pronominal relative, descriptive-appositive ('predicative') *ni-*: (Kate Roberts, 'Cyfeillgarwch', *Gobaith*, p. 15) *...yn rhoi cysur imi, i mi ni faliodd erioed beth a*

[68] See Ó hUiginn 1986 for a descriptive-comparative discussion of the negative relative and of this asymmetry, esp. in OI.

ddywedai neb amdanaf 'giving comfort to me, to me who have never cared what anyone said about me'; *Dyma hi, yr un Lisa Jên, ni fedrai angau na dim arall dynnu'r stiwardio ohoni* 'There she was, the came Lisa Jên, from whom neither death nor anything else could remove the serving'. An indefinite antecedent, as in MW, in Kate Roberts's *Tywyll Heno* 75: *...hen ŵr diddrwg didda nid amheuai neb ei onestrwydd.* The valency relationships are expressed through the discontinuous interaction of *na-* and resumptive pronouns.[69] I find *ny-* attested only, as variant of *na-*, after the pronominal/conjunctional *lle, zero*, or rather *lenition*, also occurs, with postnegation: *cysgod unaeth byth godi eto* 'a shadow that was never to be lifted again'. *Ny* does of course occur in Scripture idiom, which is, rather misleadingly, used for exemplification together with contemporary sources (see Williams 1980 *l.c.* and Richards 1938: parr. 89–91, etc.) This state of things would mean (a) the completion of the process of generalizing *na-* as 'included negation', and (b) the widening of the asymmetry between the affirmative and negative subsystems: whatever the precise distribution, and the oppositions and neutralizations involved, of 'relative' *a-* and adnominal *y-* + resumption, they are fully neutralized in the negative. Observe that roles (a) to (d) of *na-* are not found with the affirmative *y-*.

(a) 'that' form: thematic appositive to the thematic pronoun *yw*.[70] Note that in most cases, an adnominal or rather ad-lexemic interpretation is not ruled out, (e) below:
(P 481) *...a diamheu yw gennym na welsam eiroet uiluraeth yn un ureic kymeint ac ynot ti* '...and it is beyond doubt, that we have never seen in any woman courage as great as in you'. Also B 20f., 97f., O 111, 378 etc. (*diheu yw*); O 399f. (*da yw gennyf*), PKM 80 (*eres yw*).

(b) 'that' form: rheme or rhematic appositive
(P 197) *Kynnedyf yr orssed yw...nat a odyno heb un o'r deupeth...* 'The hill's virtue is, (whoever should sit upon it,) that he shall not leave without either of the two things:...'; *nat-* rheme, following copula *yw* in the text-grammatically special *#theme—copula—rheme #* pattern. Also P 454.
(O 211f.) *...ac y rof a Duw, Gei, nas-rodwn i euo ettwa yr y palffrei goreu yn Ynys Prydein* '...and I swear to God, Cei, that I would not give it for the best palfrey in the Island of Britain'. Also PKM 69 (*Sef yw hynny nat elont*).

(c) 'that' form: adverbal object-actant
(P 155) *Dywedaf urthyt...na dywedeis ys blwydyn y gymmeint yn y kyfryw le a hwnn* '(Why don't you speak to me?) I speak/tell you...that I have not spoken for a year as much, in such a place as this (i.e. in bed)'. Also P 57, 67, 331, 343ff., 453, B 117, 149f., 360f. etc. etc.

(d) 'that' form: ad-lexemic 'contentualization' specification (?)
(PKM 79, 81, 83) *...minheu a dyghaf dynghet y'r mab hwnn na-* 'I shall ordain this boy a destiny, that (he shall) not...'; however, *na-* here is possibly adverbal to the compound verb *'dwyn tynghet'* 'foreordain a destiny'.

[69] Consider (Islwyn Ffowc Elis): *Ile nad oedd natur ddim wedi'i baratoi* 'a place which Nature had not prepared', *dyn na wyddai Ceridwen ddim amdano* 'a man about whom Ceridwen knew nothing', *peth nas gwnaethai ers llawer o amser* 'something she has not done for a long time', *peth na fedrwch chi mo'i roi,* 'something you cannot give', *Fe wnaeth beth na-s-gwelsai'n ei wneud erioed* 'He did something she had neven seen him do', the last with a double object.

[70] The argumentation in favour of seeing in *yw* synchronically a special delocutive thematic pronoun for noun-rheme nexus, will be presented in a forthcoming study of the Nominal Sentence.

(e) 'that' form: theme-topic constituent in Nominal Sentence or Cleft Sentence

(B 97ff.) *...a ryued oed genhyf nat kyn rodi morwyn gystal a honno ym y gwneit y gwaradwyd...* '...and I found it strange that it is in spite of giving me a maiden as excellent as this, that this disgraceful deed was done'. Also O 295f.

(P 154) *Pa-achaws...na dywedy di wrthyf i* 'Why is it that you do not speak to me?'

(f) 'that' form, governed by prepositions: *hyt na-* (B 77, 79, 442); *am na-* (B 418f., PKM 79, O 608), *ual na-* (P 31, B 223, PKM 79), *guedy* na- (PKM 53), *eithyr na-* (B 141).

Observation

4. Consider (B 418f.) *...am welet y cledyf yn llad y wyr, ac na wydat pwy a'e lladei*, lit. '...because of seeing the sword killing the men, and that he did not know who it was that was killing them': *am na-* supplies in this slot the negative finite counterpart to the infinitive.

2.4.2 *Adnominal ny(t)[ac]*: antecedent and relative-complex determination

It is a somewhat surprising fact that, in the Four Branches[71], the combination of a truly specific (and not merely formally 'definite') antecedent and negative adnominal verb clause ('the... + who... not...') is extremely rare, if not altogether excluded: the specific substantival nucleus is in this *état de langue* virtually incompatible with *ny(t)-*. I interpret this phenomenon as follows. (1) Whatever its diachronic relative marking (leniting infix? See Morgan 1952: 355f., 358; Simon Evans 1964: 61 with N.1, 64m) synchronically the negative clause is marked as adnominal satellite (expansion) only by its juxtaposition to the antecedent-nucleus: it is a case of zero relative marking,[72] whereby the opposition between *a-* and *y-* is of course neutralized. (2) The determination in the negative relative constructions is structurally referable not to the antecedent, where it formally resides, alone, but rather to the whole phrase. This immediately recalls the 'phrasal determination' of the [NOUN + NOUN] phrase in Welsh.[73] I would thus suggest that, whereas antecedent determination—and it seems that in the affirmative relative it is the antecedent alone that is determinated—does not play any central role in the affirmative relative construction, a specific substantive is excluded as nucleus for the negative verbal expansion—the negative relative construction is never definite.

Observation

1. The sensitivity of Welsh phrasal syntax to nucleus determination, in itself a striking typological trait, is manifested also in three clause forms typically expanding indefinite nominal nuclei: (a) the '*glan ei galon*' (translatable as 'pure of (his) heart', 'pure-hearted') adnominal phrasal nexus-pattern: adjectival rheme, anaphorically-possessed typically inalienable substantival theme, which of course occurs also in other syntactical roles, e.g.

[71] In *Culhwch ac Olwen* one finds for this a 'mini-specimen' of the Four Branches distribution: 393, 948; 729; 764.

[72] Cf. Pedersen 1913:228f.

[73] Compare Semitic and Egyptian *izafet*-type constructions. In the Welsh noun phrase of this kind, the residence of the articles is pertinent to their incidence, determining the opposition between different junctureal grades: *y llong olew* 'the oilship', *y gwelyau tresl* 'the trestle-beds', vs. *comander y gard* 'the commander of the guard', *ffald y gwersyll* 'the fold of the camp'. Incidentally, group determination of the relative is also familiar in Arabic, where a non-definite antecedent is expanded by a paratactic (zero-marked) verbal clause; the relative pronoun *allâḏî* is restricted to the definite relative construction.

predicatively:[74] (B 21) *llongeu gyweirach eu hansawd* 'ships of more elaborate quality'; (b) the well-known (and by no means special to Celtic) *a-* + [*SUBSTANTIVE* + *ADVERBIAL*] 'sub-nexal' pattern ('adnexal' or 'included nexus') in adnominal status, again only one of its roles; *heb-* is the negative correspondent of *a-*:[75] (P 472f.) *gellast...a chanawon genti* 'a bitch with whelps', (P 311f.) *gwas...a gwisc o bali amdanaw* 'a youth...dressed in a silk garment' ('with a silk garment about him'), (O 319) *...un ystyllen heb delw eureit arnei yn amryual* '...a single board without golden design ('upon it') in variety'; (c) like (b), a special case of 'adnominal adverbial', directly adjoined to indefinite nuclei: *heb* + (*objective possessive article* +) *infinitive*, negating *wedi* + (*objective possessive article*) + *infinitive*—again, occurring also in other statuses.[76]

(a) Indefinite, quantified or generic antecedents:

Observation

2. Note in the following examples (esp. in [a], classes 1–3) the typically negative clause in which the antecedent is included as well as the equally typical subjunctive in the relative clause. These are cases of double negation and generic relative attribution, cf Latin *nemo fuit...omnino militum quin vulneraretur* (Caesar, *Bellum Civile*, 3.53.3), to predicate in effect a strong totality ('all') message.

(1) Ø-NOUN, *un-/deu-*NOUN; *ryw-*NOUN

(B 204ff.) *Ny doey ur mawr na gureic da yn Iwerdon...ni rodei hi ae cae ae modrwy ae teyrndlws caduedic ydaw* 'No great man or noble lady in Ireland would come..., to whom she did not give either a brooch or a ring or a precious royal jewel'.

(PKM 60) *Ac ny wydyat ef uot un keleuyn yno ny bei lygoden am pob un* 'And for aught he knew (lit. 'he knew not that'), there was not a single stalk at which there was not a mouse'. Note the anacoluthic resumption of the *un*-quantified antecedent. (Also O 154f.)

(PKM 85) *...nid oed gyueir arnei hi ny bei yn llawn o'e garyat ef* '...there was not any part of her that was not full of love for him (lit. 'his love')'.

(O 325f.) *...neb ryw uuyt ny welei yno digawn ohono* '(And it was clear to Owein that he had never seen) any kind of food, of which there was not enough there'. Also O 111, 393; 154. Perhaps B 286f., which would not then be a case of 'loose articulation of the sentence' (ed.'s Introd., p.xx).[77]

[74] See Pedersen 1913: 232; Mac Cana's brilliant descriptive, diachronic and comparative discussion, Mac Cana 1966; cf. the discussion of the French 'jolie des yeux' construction, Frei 1939.

[75] See discussions of the analogue construction with *agus* in Irish, usually with no special consideration of the adnominal role or nucleus determination, in Lewy 1949 par.92, Hartmann 1960, Hamp 1973: 242f., Boyle 1973 (generative), Ó Siadhail 1989: 284ff.; for French, see Eriksson 1980 (273ff. for the adnominal role).

[76] Consider the predicative adverbial status in (PKM 51f.) *tei y llys yn uac, diffeith, anghyuanhed, heb dyn, heb uil yndunt, eu kedymdeithon e hun wedy eu colli, heb wybot dim y wrthunt*... 'the houses of the court empty, desolate, uninhabited, no man or beast in them, their own companions lost, they knowing nothing about them...' This category includes predicative *yn*: (PKM 62) *ar uarch yn gyweir*... 'on a caparisoned horse'. For ModW cf. *trefn gymdeithasol wedi ei seilio ar gyfiawnder i'r tlodion* 'social order based on justice to the poor". The negative (*heb-* again), for intransitives, may correspond to *yn* + infinitive: *golwg heb fod yn hollol o ddifri* 'a look not ("without") being entirely serious'.

[77] The construction is of course striking in other, later MW texts: cf. *Brut Dingestow* 22, 27; *Yst.Carol.Magn.* (in *Chwedlau Cymraeg Canol* 117); See also exx. in Morgan 1952: 355ff.

(2) *neb, peth* 'anyone', 'something'

(P 612) *Ac ny thebygaf uot neb o'r yniuer hunn oll nit adnappo uot y mab yn uab y Puyll* 'And I do not suppose there is anyone in all this company who does not know that the child is a son of Pwyll's'. Also *ibid.* 73, 613f.

(B 321f.) *peth ny chauas eiroet ty y ganhei yndaw* (R reads *ny-s-kauas*, that is *ny* in the role of *y-*, not of *a-*; P has leniting *ny-*) 'A thing that he never had—a house in which he might be contained'. I agree with ed.'s note and translation, p.34f., and disagree with Ifor Williams, PKM 199, n. *ad* 42.3 (*peth* as 'achos, because'). Also O 221.

(3) *zero* antecedent, as existant—*ny-s*, that is, *ny* in *y-* function:[78]

(PKM 74) *Ny bu yn y llys ny-s-guyppei* 'There was in the court none who did not know of it' (*ny* as *y*).

Perhaps also (O 606f.) *...nyt oes ar y helw namyn yr un ty racco ny-s-ry-dycco iarll ieuanc...* '...there isn't in her possession anything that a young earl has not taken, except this one house yonder'.

(4) *(y) lle* '(the) place where',[79] even when we have the definite article, it is not pertinent (see the documentation in *GPC* 2122):

(PKM 55) *...yn lle ny welsynt na maen, na gueith eiryoet* '...in a place they had never seen neither stone, nor constructions' (Ifor Williams p. 237: 'Rhaid deall hyn fel yn y lle'—unnecessarily, I believe).

(O 400f.) *...am uenegi ohonof i ytti dy lles lle ny-s-metrut dy hun* 'that I should tell you your good, where you could not (do so) yourself'.

(b) Formally 'definite' pronominal antecedents (very rare):[80]

(1) Definite article as antecedent. The article in this slot does not specify, but serves as formal substantivizing nucleus for a generic relative clause 'who(ever)', 'where(ever)', 'what(ever)' (2.1.1):

(P 127f.) *a del yn waredawc... a'r ny del yn uuyd...* 'he who would come submissively...and he who would not come obediently...'

(PKM 50) *...a'r ny deryw o'r wled...treulwch chwi* 'What is left (lit. 'has not been consumed') of the feast, consume it...'

Observation

3. I suggest we read the negative clause in (B 437f.) *Weldy racco...y drws ny dylyun ni y agori* as non-relative but 'main clause': 'See yonder...the door: we mustn't open it'. This, I think, is the less banal reading: after all Bendigeidfran had not explicitly forbidden the opening of the door, but merely pointed out the effect this would have (line 400).

(2) *yr hunn* as antecedent: generic ('such...as')

(P 537f.) *Mae ymma mab it...yr hunn ny bu yt eiroet* 'Here is a child for you, such as you never had'.

(PKM 86) *...yr hynn ny medylyut ti amdanaf i* '(I am thinking) such [thoughts] as you have never thought about me'.

[78] Cf. *Culhwch ac Olwen* 578, 584, 589 etc. etc.: *yssit ny* ... varying with *yssit na-s-keffwch*...

[79] *Lle ny-*, not *lle na-*; lle 'place' is in the Four Branches only halfway grammaticalized, and not yet fully conjunctional (see Howells 1966: 46, 50) as it is in ModW ('in which').

[80] The picture presented here is largely valid for other corpora contemporary or later than ours, to judge by examples gleaned from grammars and grammatical discussions such as Morgan 1952.

3. *Discourse functions*

3.0 Category II: Discourse-function conversion

The sub-paradigm of discourse-function conversion is essentially different from clause-component conversion, although it is structurally co-paradigmatic with it. Its extent of reference is the texteme.

3.0.1 ny(t)-: nexal negator

I shall not go here into a detailed special discussion of the negation converters: *ny(t)-* + verbal nexus (e.g. P 19), *ny-t-* + non-verbal nexus (e.g. P 455f., PKM 80, 86; see above, 2.4 for adnominal *ny(t)-* and for the nexus substantivizer *na(t)-*. Their main syntactic interest lies in two perspectives: (a) the paradigmatic one, in which *ny(t)-* + verbal nexus stands in our corpus opposition to several clause forms, e.g. the affirmative unmarked Abnormal Sentence (2.3.2), to the rare *y(d)-* + verbal nexus (3.2), to *neu-* (below, 3.1); and (b) the text-grammatical syntagmatic one, esp. in the frame of *a(c)-* coordinated narrative: here *ny(t)-* + verbal nexus is a 'gear-shift' or divergence form, a delimitation, mainly for (1) the descriptive layer, (2) switching to the 'omniscient narrator's channel', (3) narrative boundary signalling (in all three cases, in fact, for imparting non-narrative information: strictly narrative main-line information is affirmative). Consider the following examples: (1) (P 11f.) *Ef a glywei llef erchwys arall ac nit oedynt unllef*... 'He heard the cry of a second hound-pack, and they were not of the same note'; (2) (PKM 73) *Gwyr y Deheu a gerdassant ac argan truan ganthunt parth ac eu gwlat ac nit oed ryued:*... 'The Men of the South went with woeful lamenting towards their country, and it was no wonder:...'; (3) (PKM 88) ...*ac yna bwrw ehetuan ohonaw ynteu yn rith eryr a dodi garymleis anhygar ac ny chahat y welet ef odyna y maes* '...and then he flew up in the form of an eagle, and gave a terrible screech, and was seen no more from then on'.

3.1 neu-, neut-, neu-t-: nexus focusing/superordinating conversion

This element, essentially Middle Welsh (acc. to GPC, mainly 12–14th centuries; well attested in early poetry), is occasionally described as 'emphatic'[81], but usually as 'affirmative' (Simon Evans 1964: 169f.), 'assertive', 'declarative', or 'of hardly graspable meaning' or with no functional statment at all; *neu-t-* 'a (kind of) copula'.[82]

Observations

1. The only monographic treatment of *neu-* to date is Caerwyn Williams 1976 (referred to in GPC 2575), with a good collection of exx. and formal analysis, concentrating on the element in association with nominal/pronominal themes and rhemes ('copula usage') yet with no functional statement converning the element itself.[83]

2. In our corpus, *neu-* does not lenite (there are rare early exx. for aspiration). The prevocalic allomorph *neut-* (rare: in the Four Branches, only P 210f.) must be kept apart from

[81] Morris Jones 1931: 181, Morgan 1952: 150 n., 152, 276, noting structural and functional affinities with the negator *ny-* and with *ys-*.

[82] Pedersen 1913: 290 and Lewis-Pedersen 1961: 259, *en passant* under OI *no-*; Morgan 1952: 363f.; Caerwyn Williams 1976.

[83] See Morris Jones 1931: 181 ('appears to be used when the statement is emphatic'); Wagner 1972a: 41ff.

the homonymic syntagm *converter* + *nexus-marker* (or *rheme indicator*) *neu-t-*, occurring with noun-rheme or constituent nexus;[84] *Neu-r-* is the fairly common syntagm form for *neu-* + the pre-lexeme prefix *ry-* (see 5).

There is a pronounced functional difference between *neu-* in dialogic and in narrative textemes. The converter occurs only with affirmative nexus, and past tense verb forms.

In DIALOGUE:

(a) nexus focusing, in responsive or reactive function (reaction to a response, to a reactive question, to a developing situation.) Note in the exx. below the frequent resumption, as rheme in a focused nexus, of the same verb lexeme as in the preceding cotext. A 'speaker's present' 'now' deictic component is typical.

Observation

3. The nexus—the link between theme and rheme, formally signified by the copula—is here focused as one of the three basic constituents of the clause, viz. theme, rheme and nexus. A nexus may be focused, just as it may be queried, negated,[85] presented or introduced as existant.[86] This is in fact no less than a high-order rheme, paraphraseable as: 'predication or assertion of the validity (or cogency) of predicating [RHEME] of [THEME]'—a rheme in itself predicated of a present-based ('*hic-et-nunc*') situational theme. It is noteworthy that nexus focusing by *neu-* is in our corpus limited to verbal and nominal-rheme nexus (not so in other phases of MW, see exx. in Caerwyn Williams 1976). This high-order rhematicity appears to be closely associated with the responsive dialogic subsystem (cf. other focalizing patterns in the responsive slot; see below, 3.3.2).

(PKM 80) *Ie...neu-r-gauas ef enw* (following the unconscious naming of Lleu by Arianrhod) 'Indeed: he **has** got a name (now)'

(PKM 83) *A derw—heb ef—wiscaw amdan y gwryaic hwnnw? # Deryw—heb hi # Neu-deryw y minheu—heb ef* '"Is arming that youth completed?" said he. "Completed" said she. "Mine, too, is indeed completed", said he.'

(PKM 83) *Dygyuor—heb ynteu—y dorri dy dyngheteuen am dy uab ac y geissaw arueu idaw. Ac neu-r-gauas ef arueu* 'A mustering' said he 'to break your destiny concerning your son, and to procure arms for him; and indeed he **has** (now) got arms'.

(P 483) *Neur-diffetheeist di hun dy uab* 'Indeed, you **have** destroyed your child yourself', in the women's long and aggressive self-exoneration following Rhiannon's question 'Where is the child?'

(P 318) *Neu-s-rodes y uelly* 'Indeed, I **have** given it like this', following Rhiannon's question 'Why have you given your answer like this?'

(P 469) *Och neu-r-colles y mab* 'O, the child has indeed been lost!' following as a reaction to having looked for it in vain.

[84] *Pace* Lewis-Pedersen 1961: 259.

[85] Witness even the focusing (on a higher level) of negative nexus in *neu-t-nat-*, Morris-Jones 1913: 426, Caerwyn Williams 1976: 285, GPC 2575 1b: 'It is that...not...' ('C'est que... [ne...pas]'), not 'It is not that...'. This is not highlighting the verbal lexeme or notion, but, as Morgan 1952: 176 puts it (regarding a certain relative construction), 'pwyslais ar 'ffaith' y ferf'.

[86] In *nit-ytt-oed-* (P 117) we probably have the negative existential statement of an affirmative nexus ('it isn't that...'); in *nid-nad-* (ModW), the neg. existential statement of a negative nexus: *Nid na wyddai beth oedd omlet a chafiar a phast foie-gras* 'It's not that she did not know what an omelet and caviar and *pâte de fois gras* were' (Islwyn Ffowc Elis).

[Cf.(O 613) *Neur-golles, arglwydes—heb hi* ('Oh, girl,' said the countess, 'Where is all the ointment?') 'It **has** indeed been spent, Lady' said she. This follows explicitly directions to use the ointment (line 591).
(PKM 65) *Neu-ry-geueist gwbyl a'r a nodeist* (following a long bargaining by Manawydan) 'You **did** get (now) all you asked for'.
(P 122) *Neu-t-teruinedic angheu y mi* 'It is definite death for me indeed'.[87]

(b) Constituent focusing (into adverbial status):
(PKM 61) *Na weleis—heb ef—neu-t-seith mlyned un dyn yma* 'I have not seen—said he—for seven years (lit. 'it's/it's been seven years now') a single man here'. An answer.

Observation

4. Here *ys-* seems to be a true concurrent of *neu-t-*, even synchronically: see below, 3.2.2.

In NARRATIVE (rare):

Superordinating an '*-oed*' past form (traditionally, 'plpft.' of *mynet*) to a preceding temporal clause, the whole complex expressing, hyperbolically and emphatically, the immediacy of the superordinated action-state, or the simultaneity or coincidence in time of both action-states.[88] This, on the complex level of clause complexes, and as a hierarchical feature, is simultaneously a highlighting or focusing as well as a delimitative narrative structure-signal. (The term 'connective', usually applied to the formal exponents of this function, is therefore not helpful.)
(P 210) *a phan doeth yn y herbyn y'r ford, neut-athoed hi heibaw* 'and when he came towards her to the road, she had already gone past'; and, similarly
(P 240) *a chynn daruot idaw ymgueiraw yn y gyfrwy, neu-ry-adoed hi heibaw* (MSS *neurry* and *neirry*) 'and before he settled himself in his saddle she had already gone past'.

Observations

5. In *Culhwch ac Olwen* we find a single instance of either role: superordinating, in narrative (1028 *neur-daroed idaw diffeithaw* 'It had already happened that he laid waste'), and focusing in dialogue (878 *neut-ydynt yn gynyon*, v.l. *yd-ydynt* 'My wings' stems are stumps indeed!' or, perhaps, '...are already stumps'). Note that the 'disjunctive' *neu-* is in this text attested only as question-opening (cf. Greek 'ê: 432, 434, 514f.). I have no systematic details on OW *neu(t)-*; in *Canu Taliesin* V (*BT* 59) we find a series of superordinated *neut*-introduced apodotic Cleft Sentences following 'case setting' *ossit*-protases: *Ossit uch ymryn—neut uryen ae gryn / Ossit uch ym pant—neut uryen ae guant...*

6. The functioning of the pre-nexus element *si* in Romance is noteworthy in this context. For Old French (narrative), see Rychner 1970 (esp. Chapter VI) and 1971, Fleischman 1990: 189f. and 1991. The superordinating construction generally known by now (in Italian grammar) as 'paraipotassi' is especially significant. The term, coined and defined by Sorrento as early as 1929 (Sorrento 1950: 27) as 'la coordinazione d'una sovraordinata a una precedente sua subordinata, di solito avverbiale o partecipiale'; cf. also the terminological dictionary definition (Cardona 1989: 228) 'una sequenza sintattica... costituita da una

[87] *Pace* Caerwyn Williams 1976: 280 n.4, 'It is certain death for me' or 'Death is certain/has been decided for me'. I must often disagree with the author's analysis of the Nominal Sentence patterns themselves, and occasionally with his analysis and assignment of specific examples (I hope to discuss these issues in a subsequent study of the Nominal Sentence.); I believe it is the element *-t-* in *neu-t-* that constitutes the copula, not the 'particle'.

[88] Cf. Sorrento 1950: 60ff.—see Obs. 6 on Italian *si*.

proposizione secondaria prolettica e da una principale posposta che riprende la secondaria con un connettivo (per esempio *e*)' (see also Durante 1982: 113ff.). The Italian pre-nexal morph *sí* is a member of the binary 'paraipotesi'-marking paradigm (of which the other, much more frequent and probably unmarked member is the superordinator *e*).[89] The functional similarity of this *sí* (likewise deictic in origin: context- and cotext-resumptive), occurring in older phases of literary Italian, to our *neu-* is remarkable: superordinating (in 'parasipotassi') in narrative, nexus-focusing in dialogue. Note the following exx. from Boccacio's Decamerone, for the dialogic function of *sí*: (I 1,72) O gli uomini bestemmiano tutto il giorno Idio e *sí perdona Egli volentieri* 'Why, people blaspheme against God the whole day long, and forgive them he does, willingly', (II 9,6) Se io credo, ella il fa, e se io nol credo, *sí'l fa* 'Do it she does, whether I believe it or not' (lit. 'If I believe it, she does it; If I don't, she still does do it'; Cf. also III 7, 22 and IV 8, 15—all cases of double functioning: apodosis-opening superordination and nexus-focusing; (III 8, 56) Mai non la batterò... se non del vino... e anche non ci ha mandato candela niuna...—*Sí fece bene*, ma elle arsero alle messe 'I should never beat her... were it not for the wine... and also, she did not send us here any candles'—'Send she did, but they burnt out in the masses' —the pro-verb *fare* is here focused as representant of the nexus. The nexus-representant may even be zeroed, consider VIII 10,32; (X 2,14) L'abate... ancora che con isdegno il facesse, *sí mangiò il pane* 'The abbott, though he did it haughtily, did eat the bread and drink the wine'.[90] Both French and Italian use nexus-prefixed *sí* (*sí, sí che-*) in responsive or reactive status, as a focused-nexus insisting response or reaction to an assumed negative statement, or in a generally 'negative context': this too recalls the dialogic role of our *neu-*. *Or sí-* is used with performatives in Old French (see below, 3.3.3): see M.-L. Ollier, *Romania* 110: 321–3 (1989).

3.1.0.1 A comparative note

The association of *neu-* with Indo-European **nŭ̆* (two prosodic and functional entities, enclitic/proclitic, with a short or long vowel)[91] seems to me very probable, even if the formal way to *neu* (OI *no-/nu*)[92] is not straightforward and the double reflex converter *neu*/temporal *nu*[93] (OI *no/nu*?) must still be accounted for, either by the difference in quantity in the reconstructed etyma and attested cognates—*neu* as proclitic reduction of **nou*? (for *nou-*, attested once in OW, see GPC 2599)[94]—or else by postulating as etymon for *neu* a proclitic-enclitic amalgam such as is attested practically in all IE languages documenting *nu*.[95] The functional ambivalence of 'preverbal' and disjunctive *neu* is, as I see it, not really problematic, and there is certainly no

[89] Sorrento 1950: 57f. for Latin, 43ff. for Rumanian *si*, generalized as a coordinating connective; Italian *sí* is characteristic of certain texts (and of a certain register or style?), e.g. the 14th-century *Fioretti di S. Francesco*.

[90] For narrative superordination in Homeric Greek (by means of *-de*), see Rosén 1973; see below for similar roles of Hittite *nu-*, cognate to our *neu-*. *So* is of course used for superordination in German, *'az-* (a proclitic alternant of 'then') in Israeli Hebrew.

[91] So, hesitantly, Pedersen 1913: 290f.

[92] OI *no* is functionally very different, being much more formalized than its Brythonic cognate (Thurneysen 1946 par. 538 'has no apparent meaning'); its special association with the adnominal (relative) clause may of course go back to the non-subordinative beginnings of the latter. Incidentally, Pedersen (1913:262) comments on the special status of *no-*, which is not a 'Tempuspraeverb' but belongs with other (non-temporal) 'preverbs'. See Meid 1963: 132ff.

[93] Relatively rare; Evans 1964: 221, GPC 2599. It is enclitic, occurring as inter-sentential particle following an imperative, *Culhwch ac Olwen* 756.

[94] Also in O. Breton: see Fleuriot 1984. Fleuriot associates Breton *na-* with our *neu-*, yet the distribution of the two is strikingly different. The Breton element is compatible with negation, imperatives, subordination, and seems to be a true 'particle', not a converter.

[95] **Nu-i*? Howells 1967: 138 suggests **nu-is*.

need to separate them etymologically and reconstruct **ne-ue* for the disjunction[96] in view of the same multiple functioning in most reflexes of **nu*.[97]

It is noteworthy that the special double functioning of *neu-* is more closely matched by eastern Indo-European rather than by western representants of the family:[98]

Hittite *nu*:[99] proclitic, focusing, superordinating, disjoining;[100] remarkable is the construction [*nu-* + time expression], where the particle serves as a focusing element: cf. our PKM 61 and Latin *nu-dius* + ord. number.[101]

Observation

The special formal and structural-typological affinity of Celtic with Hittite has been repeatedly demonstrated and commented upon, among others by Dillon 1947: 19ff., Wagner 1969: 221ff., Watkins 1963.

Tocharian *no* (B), *nu* (A), enclitic (often as second component): focusing (in dialogue), superordinating, disjoining.[102]

Vedic, Sanskrit *nu*, proclitic (many combinations with following enclitics): superordinating, disjunctive.[103]

Old Church Slavonic *nu*, proclitic: focusing (contrastive emphasis only),[104] but also in disjunctive function.

In the West Indo-European linguistic groups the functional similarity to Celtic is more clouded:

Latin *num*, combined in *nun-c*: the former interrogative (the dialogic role of **nu*) but originally and often synchronically reactive to situation and expressive;[105] for *nu-dius* + ordinal number (*nudius tertius* 'the day before yesterday'; cf. our PKM 61), see above (Hittite).

Greek *nu(n)* (combined in *nun-i*): superordinating, both enclitic and fully-stressed.[106]

For the reflexes of Germanic **nu(n)*—Gothic *nu*, *nu-nu*, interr. *nu-h*, OHG, MHG *nu* (*nu-nu* and *nu-a*, *nu-ra*:)—the isolable functions are again superordination (the most striking) and disjunction,[107] and what seems to be nexus-focusing.[108] In Modern German too, *nun-* is combined with enclitic particles (*-doch*, *-schon*, *-mal*, *-ja*).

[96] So e.g. Thurneysen 1961 par.885; Vendryes 1983: N17f. and 23 for both OI *no* and W *neu*; it is queried, GPC 2574f. with no specific etymology given for the '*geiryn*', 2575.

[97] Lehmann 1974: 119, Meid 1963: 132ff. I believe the association of *neu-* (*no-*) with IE **nu* is generally accepted by now, as is also the compatibility of the 'connective' and disjunctive functions. What I wish to contest here is the facile claim of synchronic 'meaninglessness' for *neu*. Italian *sí* (see Obs. 6 above; < Latin *sic*) too is both nexus-focusing and superordinating as well as disjunctive: see Rohlfs 1969 par. 760.

[98] Cf. K.H. Schmidt, *BBCS* 38:1–19 (1991) and *ZCPh* 45: 38–65 (1992), esp. 52ff.

[99] See Wagner 1959: 157 (no functional statements); 1972a: 36ff. 41ff. for *neu-*); Watkins 1963: 13ff. is the most penetrating comparative discussion of *no-* and IE, Hittite **nu*, as a 'sentence connective'. I find this term too comprehensive, subsuming and obscuring the distinctions between various interclausal dependencies. Neither our converter nor OI *no-* are included in the typological discussion in Schmidt 1982.

[100] Friedrich 1960: 155–61, Carruba 1969: 51ff. Rosén 1973: 316, Lehmann 1986: 269.

[101] Watkins 1963: 17f.

[102] Sieg 1931: 308, Thomas 1960: 172, 1964: 205; See Bader 1974–5: 394ff. (connective and disjunctive). On p. 392, Bader states *neu(i)* is 'vide de sinus', but attributes to it an apodotic role (i.e. superordinative). *neu-* is not included in the typological comparison in Schmidt 1972.

[103] Speijer 1886 par. 414, 2; 415; Hartman 1966: 55ff. The particle *vai* (Speijer 1896: 69f., Hartman 1966: 62ff.) seems to have a nexus-focussing role in dialogue similar to our *neu*, and indeed is the Sanskrit correspondent to Tocharian *nu*.

[104] Vaillant 1977:221f.

[105] Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr II 462f.; see p.464 for the association of *num* and *nun-c*.

[106] Kühner-Gerth 1955: 118, Schwyzer 1966: 571; focusing in Cretan legal inscriptions? ibid. 119.

[107] Lehmann 1986: 269, Streitberg 1910 par. 338.2; Benecke-Müller-Zarnke 1963: 419, par.2a, b, narrative; Lexe 1974 II 117f.; Behaghel 1928: 224ff.; Markey 1987.

[108] Benecke-Müller-Zarnke 1963: 420, par.3b, c, dialogue; Behaghel 1928: 229ff.

3.1.1 Excurse I: Nexus focusing and typographical prominence in ModW

Typographical and tagmemic focus (and more generally prominence) marking overlap only partly. Obviously, the question arises whether there is a more or less complex 'reproductive' relationship here between the written code and the suprasegmentals of the spoken one. Also, influence of English typographical and/or prosodic focus marking (and the mannerism of authors) must be taken into account, although it will be noticed in the examples below that the location of the emphasis or the emphasis itself lies, more often than not, rather uneasily or heavily on the English translation of the Welsh. In some cases, the use of 'prominence italics' instead of segmental means such as the 'augens' pronoun (*myfi...*) may be due to such interference. Needless to say, we are dealing here with highly conventionalized formal means, doubtlessly involving editorial policy. (The following exx. are from Daniel Owen, Kate Roberts, Islwyn Ffowc Elis and *Y Faner*).

(a) Verbal nexus focusing marked in the entire finite-verb syntagm, in cases where the 'synthetic' verbal form ('present-future', my 'aorist': see below) is used instead of the adverbial-analytic one: *Mi* ***wn*** *fod 'na rywbeth* 'I *know* there is something', *Fe* ***ddylech*** *chi fod yn farw*, 'You *ought* to be dead', *Beth* ***allai*** *fynd o'i le*? 'What *could* be wrong?', *Beth* ***wnawn*** *ni* 'What *shall* we do?' (typograhical and tagmemic focusing diverging). For similar purpose, tagmemic focus marking, in a special homolexemic # *zero-* + VERB—*actualizing converter* + VERB # : *Gallai, fe allai wneud heb Cecil* 'She *could* do without Cecil'. It is evidently impossible to distinguish between *nexus* and *lexeme* prominence in this way. The latter is perhaps marked tagemically, by *gwneud-* isolation of lexical and 'grammatical' components: *Mi wnes iddo ddawnsio* 'I made him dance', also (?) *Wnewch addo!* 'Do promise!', *Wna'i ddim aros* 'I shan't stay'; and in the Cleft Sentence: *Priodi a wnaeth ynteu* 'Marry he did (after all)'.

(b) Existential statement focusing: *Mae 'na rywbeth* 'There *is* something', ***Roedd*** *yna waith dychryn arno* 'There *were* (visible) on him the effects of fear'.

(c) I find especially interesting adverbal-nexus focusing, markable in individual constituents of the analytic predication form: *Mae o* ***yn*** *wir felly* 'It *is* true, then', *Ceridwen,* ***peidiwch*** *â dibynnu arna'i!—'Rydw i* ***yn*** *dibynnu arnoch chi.* 'Ceridwen, don't rely on me'—'I *am* relying on you', *Roedd hi* ***yn*** *caru'r llanc cryf* 'She *did* love the sturdy youth', *Rydych chi* ***wedi*** *marw* 'You *have* died (*are* dead)'. Contrast, for 'true' ungrammaticalized adverbial rhemes, i.e. other than nominal or verbal predication, *Yr* ***oedd*** *hi mewn cariad* 'She *was* in love'.

Observation

It is *yn* which carries the typographical marking, as the formal (iconic) *signifiant* of the nexal dependence (in this iconic sense, 'copula'), as belonging neither in the theme-phrase nor in the rheme-phrase, or mediating between theme and rheme.

Also, contrast this with tagmemic 'segmentation' (homolxmic extraposed topic): *Ydw, Martha, 'rydw i'n iawn* 'I *am* all right, Martha', *Byddaf, Martha, mi fydda i'n olreit,* 'I *shall* be all right', *Ydi, mae Cymru ar werth* 'Wales *is* for sale'. I see this construction as consisting of the topicalized non-actualized, zero-converter[109] form of the verb followed by the actualized rhematic form

[109] As evident in '*Oes, mae...*': *oes* is the specific post-converter allomorph of *mae*.

(converted by *y-*, *mi-*, *fe-*).[110] However, in *Rydech chi'n ei garu o, ydech* 'You *do* love him', or *Yr oedd caru Greta, oedd* 'He *did* love Greta', the construction is different, the zero-conversion form, following as a 'non-interrogative tag' or confirming tag', is the responsive (below, 3.3.2; see 3.3.0.2 Obs.1 for the responsive as a 'checking tag'). Contrast also with verb-lexeme typographical focusing in the same nexus pattern: *Rydach chi'n* ***dal*** *i gredu...?* 'Do you *still* believe...?' *Mae 'na ddigon o bobl yn* ***gweld*** *nadroedd gleision yn 'u diod* 'There are enough people who *see* adders in their drink', *'Dydw i ddim yn eich nabod chi.—Ddim...yn fy* ***nabod***? 'I don't know you'.—'Not *know* me?' This apparently neutralizes with the verb-nexus focusing in the case of interrogative rheme: *Beth sy wedi* ***digwydd***? 'What has *happened*?', with typographical and tagmemic focusing diverging. Lexemic part-focusing is also typographical: ***digwydd*** *pasio oeddwn i* 'I *happened* to be passing by'). For tagmemic focusing of the lexeme we find of course the Cleft Sentence: *Ar y trên daeth y Cymro, ond cerdded wnaeth y Sais* 'The Welshman came by train, but the Englishman *walked*', *Ond Alfan, chwarae'r oeddwn i* 'But Alfan, I was (only) *playing*'. Negative-nexus focusing: *Dydw i ddim yn rhyfeddu* 'I do *not* wonder'.[111]

Actant focusing/topic prominence: *Ydach chi ddim*? 'Aren't *you*? *'Wn i ddim beth i'w feddwl* '*I* (for one) don't know what to think' (topic), *Mae Henderson yn gofidio mwy heddiw nag ydw i* 'Henderson is today more worried than *I* am', *Wyddech chi ddim beth* 'You didn't know *what*'. *Beth ddwedsoch chi*? 'What did you say?' shows how the inherently rhematic—and automatically, hence non-pertinently clefted—interrogative may be focused.

Circumstant focussing: *Ei di ddim i'w weld o* ***heno***, *siŵr* 'You won't go to see him *tonight*, I'm sure'.

Possessor (noun-rheme-part) focusing: *F'ymennydd* ***i***, *Henderson, ydy hwn* 'It's *my*, Henderson's, brain!'.

3.2 y-, e-, y-/zero (-ry)-, y(d)-: present actualizing conversion ('egocentric' and reporting tense?)

This is in our corpus the most elusive of converters, also because it is very rare and difficult to isolate with complete certainty from the nexus-substantivizing *y(d)-*, and especially because of the diachronic complexity of the set of pre-verbal elements containing or written as *y-*. Three main phases, always transitory, are observable: older *yd*$^{\text{ten-}}$ and *y(d)-*; middle *y(d)-*; later *y(d)-* and *y(r)-*, always with the uncertainty of autonomy/dependance syntactic status, the difficulty of syntactic articulation, shadowing the functional assignment of the morphs. Formally speaking, in the few conclusive instances, we find a syntagm of *y-* with affirmative past-tense verbs.

Observations

1. As was stressed above, this converter is rare, and is certainly not found 'regularly before an independent clause' (so Pedersen 1913: 232 and even Greene 1972: 65), and thus cannot be lightly taken as that 'basic' or 'statistically normal' and in MW ousted 'VSO' ('verb-initial') pattern to be (diachronically? synchronically?) confronted with the Abnormal Sentence (so for instance Arwyn Watkins 1977/8: 367, 1988: 8 (iii), or Poppe 1990a: 44, 1990b: 454f. See 2.3).

[110] Cf. the so-called 'Tautological Infinitive' verb focalization construction, typical of Egyptian, all Semitic and other languages ('dispiacere non mi dispiacete', 'Schlafen schlief ich nicht'), see Goldenberg 1971.

[111] Cf. Mac Cana 1991: 65ff.

2. *Y(d)-* (e.g. before some finite forms of <*bot*>) is recongnized in the grammatical literature; 'declarative', 'cadarnhaol', are again its usual functional descriptions; 'actualizer' is Poppe's apt term, Poppe 1990a: 45, and may have already been Wagner's view, Wagner 1959: 82: 'unabhängige[r] Aussagesatz...normalerweise mit einem asemantischen oder grammatisch-abstrakten proklitischen Präfix versehen',[112] Howells too considers *y-* 'purely formal', albeit in a different, morphological sense: 'a pre-verbal particle with the sole function of maintaining the verb in conjunct form', Howells 1967: 140). Synchronically speaking, *y-* forms of <*bot*> constitute a different formal/functional group (see section 5 below). This brings us to the diachronic perplexity of relating this and our actualizing converter with the element or elements *yd[=]* attested in earlier phases of Welsh and in non-narrative textemes, e.g. poetry, but not in our corpus, where *d* characterizes the pre-vocalic allomrph of the nomializer *y-* and the actualizer before forms of <*bot*>. As pointed out above, the uncertainty (and circularity) of syntactic articulation plays a role in the confusion reigning over discussion of *y-* converters;[113] but it is striking that there are hardly any conclusive instances of *yd[=]* as clause-initial actualizer.[114]

3. In view of the semantically compound *perfectum praesens* temporal reference, it is certainly tempting to see the actualizing *y*—in Functional Sentences Perspective analysis—as a present-indication formal theme in a present-tense kind of nexus with the following rhematic verb-form. There is, however, no clear independent support for this interpretation.

4. Unfortunately, one cannot regard Jones's *rapprochment* of ModW actualizer *y(r)-* with the definite article (Jones 1975/6: 337ff.) as entirely conclusive, although I for one find it attractive; it is in fact even more difficult to reconcile with the MW morphological divergence between the article and the converter. Still—diachronically speaking—the formal overlapping of the two can hardly be ignored. (*All* converters are, in point of fact, actualizers; moreover, the unconverted finite verb cannot be simply regarded as 'nominal' and thus as compatible with definite-article actualization).[115]

5. I consider as non-conclusive such cases of *y-* as are not strictly initial, e.g. (1) *ac y-* + *VERB*, esp. coordinated to any *y-* + *VERB* (e.g. B 48, 167, P 637, 645); (2) of *y-* + *VERB* following any adverbial (e.g. B 48, 350, P 645 etc. etc.), that is to say

[112] Actually, Wagner seems to have here in mind ModW *mi-/fe*. Three features of our actualizing *y-* recall Egyptian (Old and Middle) *iw-*: first, its very actualizing role; second, its 'hic-et-nunc' deixis, making for an 'egocentric' *perfectum praesens*/reporting compound tense set—*iw-* + past tense (adverbial or 'circumstantial' [*sdm.n.f* or Stative]) in Egyptian, in a present-tense nexus: 'I am [lit. 'my present-state is'] having-come'; see Polotsky 1965, 1976. Wagner saw the typological connection, even on the basis of information drawn from Gardiner's still fumbling *Egyptian Grammar*. (Wagner 1959: 175f., 258; 1977; 210 +n.23, although *iw*—or for that matter our *y*—is certainly not a 'copula', but a formal actualizing deictic theme.) Third and most intriguing: as now becomes increasingly clear, *iw-* too, like Welsh *y-*, comprises in fact two homonyms, one initial and actualizing, the second dependent (a 'circumstantial' gerund-like *-ing*-form).

[113] Thus Pedersen 1913: 232, Lewis-Pedersen 1961:144f. ([*yd[=]*] 'used only before verbs beginning with a consonant', later displaced by non-leniting *y(d)-*; and 206, with a mixture of initial and dependent examples; Morgan 1952: 176f. (for some reason, exc. of *yd[=]*—only with following initial velars!); also Baudiš 1916: 110 and 1933: 394ff.

[114] Bromwich and Evans 1988: xxv + Index; in 41, 381, 389, 795 (complex clauses) *yd[=]-* marks the topic ('*glase*') of Cleft Sentences, while in 27, 541, 791 (phrases) it follows the circumstant/indirect object as a 'that' we may indeed have our 'egocentric' actualized tense, unless, in view of the clearly thematic verb, this is again a Cleft Sentence, in the very rare topic-initial variant pattern (the topic resuming a preceding question):—'On what errand have you come?—It is to look for Olwen we have come.' ('That we have come is...'); so too 1045, ...*pei as rodei y neb, y rodei uerth eir Odgar brenhin Iwerdon* 'If he gave it to anyone, it is at the word of Odgar, King of Ireland, that he would give it'; perhaps also 930f. *A wys...pa du y mae hi?—Y mae...yn Aber Deu Gledyf* 'Is it known whereabouts she is?—She is at Aber Deu Gledyf'

[115] Cf. the actualizing *y(r)-* in the ModW '*Oedd, yr oedd*' nexus-focusing pattern: above, 3.2.

First-person ('egocentric') dialogue and narrative; report

(B 148) *E doeth im—heb ef—y gan wr a uu y'th wlat ti* ('Whence has the cauldron you have given me come to you?')—'It came/has come to me'—he said—'from a man who had been in your land'. The verb is clearly thematic. R's reading ('*ef a-*') means no more than the use of the neutral (unmarked) narrative tense. Cf. *Culhwch ac Olwen* 477 (see above, Obs.2).

(B 167) *Y kymereis inheu wyntwy arnaf yu gossymdeithaw...* 'I took it ('them') upon me to maintain them...'. First-person reporting narrative.

(B 175) *E dodeis inheu ar gynghor uy gwlat beth a wneit amdanunt* 'I put (it) to my land's council what was to be done about them'. First-person reporting narrative.

The sole instance I find in the Four Branches of non-egocentric narrative:

(P 560f.) *Y rodet y march y'r mab* (W; R yna y rodet...) 'The horse was given to the child', must, I believe, be considered doubtful, and perhaps to be emended with R.[116]

Observations

6. Instances of leniting *yr-* are often unnecessarily taken for a variant graphemic actualization of the aspectual pre-lexemic *ry-* (so Ifor Williams in PKM, Simon Evans 1964: 169, *Branwen's* editor); I suggest this be seen as the non-zero variant of the normal conditioned zeroing of actualizing *y-* before *ry-*, in exact analogy to the occasional and sporadic non-zeroing of the substantivizing *a-* and *y-* (par. 2.1–2 above): (B 69) *Yma y mae brenhin Iwerdon, ac yr-gyscwys gan Uranwen dy chwaer* 'There is the King of Ireland here, and he has slept with your sister Branwen', report; (PKM 49.18) *Seith centref Dyuet yr-edewit y mi* 'I have been left the seven centrefs of Dyfed', first-person report.

7. I doubt that (O 390) *Ys-gwneuthum i dyti yn gyfoethawc* has our converter preceding the infixed pronoun ('I have made it, your house, wealthy': see ed.'s note p.50f.; *ys-* is the reading of R only). It may be a rare nexus-focusing use of the focuser *ys-* (cf.B 307 and par. 3.2 below). (P 242f.) *Ef a dybygei yr araued y kerdei y uarch, yr ymordiwedei a hi* is difficult: it may well be an anacoluthic concessive instance of the correlative 'adverbial pronoun' *yr-...yr-...* 'He thought, slow as his horse was going, still he would overtake her' (cf. *ut../quam*[*quam*]*...tam*[*en*]; translated 'perquanto fosse' by Argati and Magini, rather than 'despite the slowness...' (Jones and Jones), i.e. the preposition *yr-* with the equative (!) as focus of *y-* and an unexplained preverbal particle. (The text is MS consensus. The second analysis is the editor's, p. 32, cf. PKM 124: 'enghraifft gynnar o *yr* gyda'r ferf').

3.2.1 Excurse II: ModW mi-/fe-

Morgan (1952: 176) associates our actualizing *y-* with *mi-* and/or *fe-* in contemporary Welsh.

[116] Outside the core corpus, in (O 788) *Y dywedassant wynteu* '(Then O. asked them the meaning of their sadness.) They said...' we have a case of *y-* in simple delocutive narrative.

Observation

The grammatical *communis opinio* on these elements considers them, at the most dismissive, as purely formal, 'unfunctional', 'asemantic' or 'meaningless',[117] of which the common 'declarative' is in fact a variant. Claim of 'stylistic' determination of the occurrence of *mi-/fe-* (Jones-Thomas 1977: 362) is yet another 'white flag' as a descriptive statement, at least in a seminal comprehensive study of the grammatical system (in fact, this seems almost a regression to an approach in which only the 'propositional content' constitutes the functional load that is of interest); while 'only' in '*mi/fe/i* [are] only selected for emphasis or narrative effect' (*ibid.*) really leaves one wondering what the authors' idea of non-trivial grammatical function may be. Occasionally, however, one feels the uneasiness of more sensitive descriptivists with this consensus, leading to frank introspective formulations that are nonetheless rather helpless as statements of function: '...more stylistic than grammatical: emphasis sometimes requires a particle, taste prohibits a too frequent use. Having got along for several sentences without using the particles, we may suddenly feel that one is needed for the sake of rhythm or emphasis... The *mi* somehow earns its place; on the other hand it would be hard to prove that its ommission would alter the meaning' (Jones 1988: 163). The differentiation between *mi-* and *fe-* is still often defined as dialectal (north and south, respectively; this is denied or presented as problematic by others.[118]

Islwyn Ffowc Ellis, whose *Y Gromlech yn yr Haidd* (Gwasg Gomer, 1988) constitutes the basis for the examination following below, says concerning his use of the two elements in this novel (I quote from his letter of August 1990): 'The use of 'mi' or 'fe' does not affect the sense and the difference has no grammatical significance whatsoever... The change from 'mi-' to 'fe-' before a verb, whatever the sense or person, does not affect the sense, and yes, they are interchangable'. '[I would use]' 'fe-' before a verb expressing a continuing action, a process, or a beginning, to slow down the narrative, as it were. I would dispense with 'fe-' before a verb expressing a sudden or finite action, to convey urgency and perhaps speed—e.g. neidiodd, taflodd, saethais'.

An exhaustive examination of all clauses in *Y Gromlech yn yr Haidd* yields the following distributional and functional statements for *mi-* and *fe-*. (This is but a resume, with representative illustration, of the full findings of this study; I am indebted to Luisa Ferretti Cuomo for her patient help and lucid inspiration in this particular component of my study, as in so many others, in the course of a hot, waspy Oxford summer.) The following statements have been subsequently fully corroborated by the examination of a different corpus (Dafydd Parry's collection of short stories, *Burw Hiraeth*, Y Lolfa 1981).

[117] E.g. Morris-Jones 1931: 184–7; Richards 1938 par. 36.3(b): 'Pan fo'r frawddeg yn gadarnhaol defnyddir y geirynnau *mi, fe* i gynnal y rhagenw mewnol'; Morgan 1952: 366f., Wagner 1959: 82, Williams 1980: 100; M. Jones 1970: 96 ('optionally insertable in positive declaratives but compulsorily absent in interrogatives and negatives'); Awbery 1984: 266f.; Arwyn Watkins 1988 n.24. It is certainly not true that 'literary Welsh' does not use these converters (Fife 1986). King 1993: 138 mentions *mi-/fe-* briefly ('affirmative markers...entirely optional', yet 'by the way,... not meaningless as some authorities claim'. Other accounts of the verb clause (e.g. Pilch 1971. Jones 1974 Fife 1990) simply ignore them. 'Optional' is the term used by M. Tallerman ('The Directionality of Head Subcategorization', in: Fife and Poppe (eds), 1991, 311–27); cf. also 'a declarative particle (mi-/fe- (+SM) may precede all inflected verb forms (with the exception of the pres. and imperfect of *bod* "to be")' (T. Arwyn Watkins, *ibid.* 340f.; the validity of the statement itself as it stands may be queried ('affirmative, non-interrogative, non-responsive finite verb forms' would be more exact; see our p.62. Incidentally, *mi* does occur before forms of *bod*: e.g. *mi-rydw i* in D. Parry's collection, *Burw Hiraeth*).

[118] For instance: M. Jones 1970: 96, Jones 1988: 163, against Ball 1987/8: 143 n.2, 1988: 68, Thomas and Thomas 1989: 74-7; King 1993: 138 is reserved.

IRRELEVANT (incompatible with *mi/fe-*, hence indifferent to the opposition) are the following clause types: 1. negative, 2. interrogative, 3. responsive, 4. imperative (2nd person), 5. existential and possessive, 6. <*bot*> periphrastic tenses (present, perfect), 7. presentative *(llyma, dyna)*, 8. *meddai, meddwn* 'he said', 'I said'), 9. included clauses (converters and junctors: *os-,nes-*, rel. *a-, y-*), 10. parenthetic clauses (lenited:—*wyddoch*—), 11. periphrasis with infinitive and 'do', 12. Cleft Sentence focalization, 13. Nominal Sentence patterns. Elsewhere, there obtain the following two categories (paradigms):

(a) fe- vs. zero (NARRATIVE) and

(b) fe- vs. mi- vs. zero (DIALOGUE)

(a) in NARRATIVE

(a1) *fe-* with narr. preterite is the marked term of the opposition, occurring in the following lexical categories or narrative configurations. (Elsewhere, *zero* characterizes the unmarked narration form):

1. verbs explicitly or metaphorically signifying or hinting at some mental (com)motion, some inner process or happening (the 'inner story'): *Fe ddaeth rhyw galedrwydd sydyn rhyfedd i wyneb Henderson* (37) 'Some sudden strange hardness came into H.'s face', *Fe deimlodd ei bronnau'n clustogi'i frest* (53) 'He felt her breasts cushion his chest', *Fe dorrodd yr argae* (9) 'The dam broke', *Fe dorrodd i feichio wylo* (104) 'She burst into weeping and sobbing'.

2. Verbs denoting narratologically significant perception (hearing, seeing,. feeling, realization, reflection), typically with the perceived an external-world indication or reflection of an internal world: *Ond yna fe ddaliwyd ei lygad gan rimyn disglair yn y borfa* (77), 'But then his eye was caught by a shining strip in the grass' *Yna fe ddisgynnodd sŵn ar ei chlyw* (90) 'Then a sound descended on her hearing'.

3. In transition or contrast, especially across the boundaries of the external/internal or real/'surreal' realities, occasionally overlapping with (1)–(2): *Fe'i deffrowyd gan y gwartheg wrth giât y buarth yn brefu am ollyngdod i'w cadeiriau llawn. Roedd hi'n ddwyawr ar ôl amser godro* (63) 'He was awakened by the cattle at the gate of the yard, lowing for release for their full udders. It was (full) two hours after milking time'. Also in sharp change or 'turn of the narrative tide': *Ac yn y fan fe ddywedodd hi'r stori i gyd wrth Wil* (103) 'And there and then she told Will the whole story'.

4. In delimitation—chapter and/or episode opening: *Fe drefnodd Marian i gwrdd â Wil ei brawd yn y maes parcio am naw* (99) 'Marian had arranged to meet her brother Will in the parking lot at nine', *Fe ddaeth taw ar y drafodaeth yn y fan yma* (65) 'There came a lull in the discussion at this point'; superordination or highlighting: *O'r diwedd fe agorwyd y drws* (87), '[after knocking for a long time], at last the door was opened'.

To sum up: *fe-* + VERB is non-concatenating, a delimitation (I) marking a shift in narrative function, a break in the chain that signals a turning-point or the narrative unit or block in which the narration announces or clarifies (through the characters or the author's explicit information) its meaning or (II) turning the focus onto a different, internal 'discourse world', a layer or channel shift. *Zero* + preterite, on the other hand, is the concatenating, linking narrative tense, carrying the main-line, 'steady pace' plot.

(a2) *fe-* with delocutive narr. imperfect is not opposed to *zero*: it signals introspection or mental/emotional process in progress—including subjective interpretation of someone else's objective acts: planning, purpose, consideration, recall, observation, suggestion, 'scenario', throught in progress, signalling a shift to a different narrative layer. Examples:

Fe wyddai 'He knew', (50, 78f.), *Fe roddai gynnig arni fel'na, reit garedig* 'She would attempt it like that, quite gently' (80), *Fe ddwedai yntau wirionedd neu ddau* 'He, too, would say one or two truths', (33), *Fe gymerai Philips sbesimen i'r lab, ac fe allai fod yn negyddol* (77) 'Philips would take a specimen to the lab, and it might turn out to be negative'.

(b) in DIALOGUE:

mi- marks here the personal, emotionally involved, 'locutive (speaker's) perspective', *fe-* (rare and marked) the formal, authoritative, detached, 'delocutive perspective', often in modal allocation (curiously, the Englishman Henderson's 'Welsh idiolect' strikingly diverges from the Welshman's in the use of *mi-/fe-*, which contributes to his characterization as ill-bred, clumsy and slightly grotesque):

(b_1) *mi-* + preterite:

1st person: 'perfectum praesens', personal-sphere report, reminiscent narrative (67ff. *mi chwythais... mi es... mi ges... mi wnes*, 88 *mi gododd...mi ddwedodd wrtha i*, 91 *mi gollais i fab*)

3rd person: excited report: 'he/she must have...' (44 *mi syrthiodd*, 65 *mi gafodd...ofn*). Note the frequent report of mishaps.

(b_2) *mi* + imperfect:

1st person: hypothetical, remote-from-reality ('would', also in apodosis of *irrealis* condition) (10 *mi allwn*, 41 *mi fetiwn*), except for *gwybod* (= 'present', 13)

(b_3) *mi* + 'present' (aorist, *-af*, except for <*bod*>):

personal-perspective (often personal-warranty) future; present (with *gallu*, *medru*).

1st person s.: 'I'll', 'I shall': (18 *mi ddisgwylia i nes daw Mr Henderson*, 56 *mi wna i 'ngorau*)

1st person pl. ('I'm sure, I promise, I'll see to it that') 'we shall' (54 *mi awn*)

2nd person s./pl. ('I'm sure/ 'I'm afraid) you'll' (15 *mi welwch*)

3rd person s. ('I'll see to it that) 'he'll' (114 *mi ddaw Richard acw*)

(b_4) zero + 'present' (aorist, *-af*) : responsive (various persons) (98 *cewch*,122 *gwela*, 130 *cei*).

(b_5) *fe-* + 'present' (aorist), fydd-:

3rd person (also often *fe fydd*), 2nd persons: 'can', 'may', 'ought', 'must'; 1st persons, 'shall'; detached-formal, 'official' future (10f., 25, 27, 74, 107, 120, contrast 116 *fe ddaw* with the personal-warranty *mi ddaw* 114).

(b_6) *fe-* + preterite

1st person, 2nd, 3rd person: detached, 'historiographic' past statement (19 *fe'i cafodd o*, 32 *fe ddaeth*, 46 *fe wnaethoch*)

(b_7) *fe-* + imperfect

3rd person: 'ought' (45, 111), 'would' (48, 56)

3.2.2 Excurse III: ys-: adverbial-focus marker

In order phases of the language the use of prefixed *ys-*, usually understood as the 3rd-person-singular form of the 'copula', as element 'preceding the predicate'[119] seems to have been more extensive, although it is difficult to make distributional statements in the absence of genre and

[119] Pedersen 1913: 247f., Morgan 1952: 285ff., Simon Evans 1964: xxvi, 141f.; Mac Cana 1991: 73f., 'copular fronting'.

textemic comparables.[120] In the corpus studied here, the following constructions are in evidence, all affirmative, all in DIALOGUE, usually (esp. in PKM) exclamative or otherwise emotionally expressive (affective): *ys* is a constituent focussing element, invariably proclitic to the focus or rheme:

(a) adverbial-rheme/focus marker, in the pattern: *ys*-+noun phrase/*ef* [+ *y(d)*+VERB] / [*i*-(agent) + *infinitive*].

Observation

1. Note here the structural paradigmatic equivalence of the nexus-substantivizing ('that'-form) converter *y(d)*- with the '*i- cum infinitivo*', which is another included-nexus pattern in complementary distribution with the former. See 2.2.

(P 156) *Ys-glut-a-beth yd ymdidanyssam ni* 'Continually have we conversed!': *ys* focusing *glut*.
(P 177) *Ys iawn-a-beth iwch chwi diolwch* 'Rightly you should thank': *ys* focusing *iawn*.
(B 362) *Ys anhebic-a-gyflawan gan y tylwyth y wneuthur a wnaf* 'It is unimaginably outrageous for the household that I should do what I am (about to) do!', lit. 'to do what...'; i.e. 'the household will not expect (or: 'think it likely') that I should do this': *ys*- focuses *anhebic*.

Observation

2. Synchronically speaking, *a*- is, I believe, not a variant form of the preposition *o*- but a 'Kompositionsfüge' vowel between adjective and noun in a *Karmadhâraya*- ('blackboard') type of determinative endocentric compound (cf. the *varia lectio drycserch* for W's *druc a serch* in *Culhwch ac Olwen* 565).[121] The first component closely classifies the second, and it may well be that its constituency list is in complementary distribution with that of the 'preceding adjective' one, in what is itself a lenition-linked determinative compound: this obviously needs further investigation. '*Beth*' *in fine compositi* forms an analytic abstract, then true analytic derived adverbs (cf. the Romance *-ment(e)* or Germanic *wise/weise*).

(PKM 80) *Ys-llaw gyfess y medrwys y lleu ef* 'It's with a skillful hand that the fair one has hit it!'
(B 407) *Ys-da dwy ynys a diffeithwyt o'm achaws i* R, *da a dwy ynys* (no *ys*) W (I.W. in PKM 216 '*dwy ynys dda*'!) 'Well two islands have been destroyed on my account!' (in the reinforceing sense of *well-*, *wohl-*, French *bien-*, Italian *ben-*): *ys* focusing *da*.
(O 44f.) *Ys ef y rodaf inneu ar awch dewis chwi* 'Thus I put it to your choice', see ed.'s note, p.52. Probably also P 169 *ef ar y medwl hwnnw yd oedwn* 'Its thus, in this opinion that I was too', *sef* cataphoric-adverbial to the prepositional phrase.
(O 684) *Ie, ys gwir* 'Yes, it's true!' ('truly so' or "verily': a full responsive utterance).
(PKM 53) *Ys gwell in—heb ef—kyrchu tref arall* 'It is better—said he—that we should make for another town'.

[120] In *Culhwch ac Olwen*, *ys* is used once responsively, for anchoring a Cleft Sentence in discourse (565f.): *Ae [ti a eirch...?*—(response:) *Ys-[mi a'e heirchi]*, cataphorically (*Ys ef...*, 908, 938f.), twice before the rheme in a special Nominal Sentence pattern (*Ys gohiliaw hunnu*, *Ys huy yr rei hynny*: 472, 598) and once, as in the Four Branches, *Ys...-a-beth* (132).

[121] Morgan 1952: 351, but see p. 391; Simon Evans 1964: 37, *GPC* 1 (a[4]) consider it a separate preposition, *GPC* stressing its role in nominal compounds. I suspect that the ModW type '*drwg o beth*' plays a retrospective role in the analysis of MW *-a-* as a preposition or *nota relationis*.

Observation

3. While *gwir yw...* (e.g. PKM 62), delocutive Nominal Sentence with adjectival rheme + expanded *yw*-theme ('It's true (that)...', 'Il/c'est vrai que...') is opposed as pattern to # *ys gwir* #—a full responsive utterance 'Truly (it is so)', *gwell* mostly occurs as adverbal adjunct (B 162, PKM 51,78) and as predicative, with the adverb *vs.* adjective opposition neutralized (following *oed*, PKM 57, O 392, *bu*, P 176, *-oes*, PKM 49 or, with *yn-*, following *bot*, B 59, O 84, 88), and is only questionably found in adnominal status (PKM 50 in *ymdidanwreic well* and O 27 *gwell ymdidanwr* are still arguably adverbal to the verbal [*ymdidan*] element in this deverbal derived compound). In PKM 69 it is found as focussed adverbial: (0 101f.) *kenys gwell yw/ Ø...menegi*

(b) *Ys- marking* adverbial status (cf. *neu-* above, 3.1 b), with zero-determinated, unquantified nouns denoting of time: (P 149, 150 R, 155, 157 R) *ys blwydyn* 'for a year', 'It's (it has been) a year since...'; (P 142) *ys talym* 'for a long time'.

(c) Compound nominal rheme / object actant focus marker (rare), in the pattern: *ys* + 'adj.-*a*-noun' compound noun + *lenition* + <*bot*> *a*-+VERB. Here too I believe *ys-* is referable to a pre-modifying ('*i.i.c.*') constitutent of a compound (*drwc*, *da*, *bychan*), which it focuses, and not to the entire noun syntagm.

(PKM 56f.) *Ys drwc-a-gedymdeith uuosti ac ys da-a-gedymdeith a golleisti* 'A bad companion you have been, and a good companion you have lost!'

(PKM 78f.) *Ys bychan-a-beth wyd dy-gwilyd-di* 'Trivial is (wont to be)/will be your shame!'

(d) Verbal-nexus focusing?—three very doubtful examples:

(B 307) ...*ac aduyd ys kymeraf gynghor* (*ys*, consensus of all 3 sources) 'and it may be that I shall take counsel about it': Ifor Williams (PKM 198): 'Tebyg yw i'r rhagenw *as* wedi colli ei rym, a throi'n eiryn rhagferfol mor ddi-liw a *fe*, neu *ef*.'; Simon Evans 1964: 173; I suggest this is the converter *y-* 'that' with a neuter infixed pronoun.

(O 390) *Ys gwneuthum i dyti yn gyfoethawc* 'I have made you rich' (see above, 3.2 Obs 6).

(O 222, R) *Duw a wyr...ys-oed gwell dy grogi di, Gei, no dywedut...* 'God knows, it were better to hang you, Cei, then that you should say...'; W has initial 'remote-from-reality' *oed-*.

Observation

4. *Ys* is not compatible with other converters, and may by this token be structurally considered a discourse-function converter itself, existentially (often expressively) stating a nexus (or focusing a nexus-constituent) that may be queried by *a-y-* (below) or negatived by *ny-t-*.[122] See 2.3.2 for the AS as an existential-presentative construction.

3.3 The dialogic functions:

In 3.3–4 I mean to discuss some of the component subsystems that, with others, make up the dialogue texteme.

[122] Cf. *Culhwch ac Olwen* 565f.: *Ae [ti a eirch...]?—Ys-[mi a'e heirch]*; neg. P 117 *nit-ytt-oydwn* 'It isn't that I was ...'.

The Aorist Tense : Functional Spectrum

time ind. reference	'extratemporal'		'present' synchronous utterance real time*			'future' 'shall'*
form (syntagm):	# ø- …-*af* #		'Abnormal Sentence' (pers.) : # *mi a -af* # neg.:# *ny(d) ..-af* # (# *a- …-af* ? #)	*a- -af* # (relative) esp.Cleft Sentence	'narrator's tense'	'Abnormal' all other constructions
	affirmative	affirma. + negative				
dialogic function:	performative (3.3.3)	reactive (3.3.2)	allocution + response	alloc. + response	locution	allocation + response
persons:	1st sgl.	1st. 3rd	all persons**	all persons**		all persons
lexemic inventory:	lim.inventory: *diolch* 'thank' *duyn* 'bring'**** dywedut 'say'	no limitation	limited inventory: (1) potentiality *cael, caffael* 'get, manage to'*** *medru* 'be able' *gwedu* 'suit, fir' (2) sensual-perceptual *clyuet* 'hear' *gwelet* 'see'**** (3) dispositive *mynnu* 'wish' *duunaw* 'agree' *kynghori* 'advise' *erchi* 'ask, beg' *gadael* 'let, allow' (last two:quasi-performatives?)	no limitation		no limitation

Key:

* 'present': not generic of habitual; 'shall': certain, definite future intention

** 'all persons': the 1st person singular is still prevalent.

*** non-perceptual *gwelet* ('realize')—future (PKM 6, 32) non-auxiliary *cael* ('get, receive')—future (PKM 34, 41, 64)

**** *vs.* future *mi a dygaf* (PKM 25), *dywedaf yn llawen* (PKM 85)

3.3.0.1 The aorist tense

The verb-form traditionally called 'present'—a morphological code-name or 'cognomen' for '<*-af*> forms', rather than a semantic or functional description;[123] I have here in mind the *personal indicative* only—is predominant in the dialogues in our corpus: I propose now to examine it briefly for its time-reference in correlation with a number of factors, prior to presenting the dialogue conversions themselves. The parameters potentially operative in this respect are (1) the lexemic constituency of the verbal nexus in this form, (2) its personal (pronominal) constituent (this form is a locutive or first-person tense *par excellence*, but occurs in most persons), (3) its binary affirmative/negative modulation, (4) its syntactic status.

[123] This is yet another instance of the obfuscating combination of both 'tyrannie de la morphologie' and 'superstition du latin': De Boer in *Rev.Ling.Rom.* 1928, 301ff. See Fife 1990:911ff; Jones 1974: 229, 237ff. Gagnepain 1962–3.

The time reference categories isolated (details are presented in the following table) are the present (non-statal) and the future (both statal and definitive).[124] The correlates of the present time reference, which is the marked function, are few:

(a) a closed lexemic list;

(b) for all lexemes, in *a-/y-* ('relative', 'that') conversion (e.g. in the Cleft Sentence—not Abnormal Sentence).

Documentation (representative; references are to pp. in PKM):

Future:

mi a af (44f.) 'I will go', *mi a brynaf* (2) 'I shall buy', *urth honno yd af i* (58) 'I will go for this': sim. 14, 15, 17, 18, 33, 34, 44, 47, 63, 70, 74, 75, etc. etc.

Present:

(a) lexemic restriction: *mi a uynhaf* (59) 'I wish', *mi a'y medraf weithon* (80) 'I can now', *ni chaun* + inifinitive (82) 'we cannot get to...', *ny elluch* (74) 'you cannot' ; sim. 13f., 19, 23, 30 etc.

(b) relative conversion, with no lexemic restriction: *Paham na daw* (43) 'Why doesn't...come?', *Pa-achaws na dywedy* (7) 'Why don't you say?', *Pan doy di* (12) 'Whence do you come'[125] *Pa-chware a wnewch* (17) 'What game are you playing?', *Pa-ryw weith a wnant* (79) 'What kind of work do they do?', *Beth a wely* (67) 'What do you see?' (perceptual); *-a garaf*, *-a gery* (12) 'Whom I/you love', *-a wely*, *a welaf* (16,76,92) 'what/which/you/I see' (perceptual), *-a dywedy* (3,14,16) 'what/which you say'.

Observation

1. The Cleft Sentence rarely contains the aorist in a future time indication: (PKM 2) *Mi a prynaf... pa-delw y pryny-di?* 'I shall buy...' 'How will you buy?'—echoing the future in the preceding Abnormal Sentence; (3) *Beth a wnaf i y'm kyuoeth?* 'What will I do to my subjects?'

(c)–(d) In the performative and responsive functions: see 3.3.2–3.

(e) 'Narrator's time' and meta-narrative role: *Llyna ual/y uelly y teruyna y geing honn...* 'Thus ends this Branch...' (27,48,65,92).

Observation

2. The present indication of the *-af* form is also found in the (archaic) poetic subtext in Math: (PKM 89f.) *dar a dyf / ony dywedaf...* 'An oak grows...' / 'If I speak not...'.

The above functional picture is associated in certain languages with verb-forms that are genetic and/or extratemporal, rather than actual-presential (see below, 3.3.2–3). I suggest that 'aorist' is

[124] The peculiarly Romance oppositions of present-based ('visée prospective') vs. non-present-based futures is absent in the Welsh system described here. Absent, that is, as a systemically established tense; the durative (periphrastic) present serves also for present/future reference: P 320f. *Yr wreic uuyaf a garaf yd wyt yn kysgu heno genthi* 'The woman I love most, you are going to sleep with her tonight'.

[125] Strictly speaking, not a Cleft Sentence or relative conversion, but an isolated related pattern, see 4.1.3.

apt as a name functionally more precise and informative for the '*-af* form',[126] presenting as it were the action in the confines of the verbal notion, with little or no reference to the specifying circumstances of its taking place. (Outside the context of Greek or Indic grammar or of [Proto]-Indo-European reconstruction, this name cannot lead to confusion with the familiar preterite. 'Aorist' is used for the generic tense in non-Indo-European languages, e.g. Turkish and Coptic). Welsh is one of those languages opposing actual (not necessarily durative) present to generic aorist.

3.3.0.2 The modal 'paradigm' and na(c)-

The paradigm of the 'imperative', traditional in Welsh grammar, is a pseudo-functional synthesized 'category' grouping rather than a morpho-functional code-name.[127] It may be broken up, for our corpus, as follows:

	singular	plural
1st person	(nil)	hortative ('*awn*', '*gwnawn*' (P 258, PKM 54) [homonymos with aorist]
2nd person	imperative 'proper', '*gwna*' (P 291)	'imperative plural' '*gwynnwch*' (B 270) [homonymous with aorist]
3rd person	jussive (sgl.) '*aet*', '*bit*' (P349, B 360, PKM 75f.)	jussive (pl.) (rare) '*diskynnent*' (P342)

Without referring here to the much-discussed comparative-etymological identy of *na(c)-*, its formal/functional person-systemic assignment shows there is neither opposition nor 'overlapping' (or polyfunctionality), and that there obtain either formal divergence or complementary distribution of the negative forms:

	singular	plural
1st person	*na(c)-* + responsive (aorist form) (below, 3.3.2)	[*na(c-)* + hortative (aorist form)] (?)
2nd person	*na(c)* + imperative (function+form) (PKM 69)	*na(c)-* + imperative (aorist form) (P 593)
3rd person	*na(c)* + jussive (function+form) (PKM 57	[*na(c)* + jussive (function+form] (?)

[126] For the functional spectrum of aoristic or extratemporal tense-forms, see Koschmieder 1945, e.g. 31, 34ff., 46f., 62ff. and passim. For the Turkish 'aorist' Koschmieder isolates and defines the following main roles: performative (see below), modal, potential, legal, generic-gnomic, 'fairy-tale' narrative, anecdotic-historiographical, scenic-instruction (cf. Wilmet 1976: 9ff). Many of these cannot be attested in MW, but are well documented in later and modern phases (e.g. the 'scenic present'). The Greek aorist is, or was, such a tense adapted and—in narrative and other 'historical' textemes—specialized as a preterite; yet its original function remains in its so-called 'gnomic' uses as well as in its traditional name, *aoristas*, 'undefined' or 'indefinite'. Discussions of the Welsh 'present-future' tense have indeed isolated its atemporal, gnomic semantic components: Fife 1990: 111ff, 117f, 125 etc.; Jones 1974: 237ff; Gagnepain 1962-3: 418ff. What I suggest here is that we see such temporal values as are decoded within different lexemic and syntactic parameters, as actualizations of the primary *aoristic* meaning.

[127] See Watkins 1963: 44ff.

Observations

1. The affinity of the imperative and responsive forms, unconverted or zero-converted (the case of the responsive) has been early and often pointed out (Morris-Jones 1931: 180, Wagner 1959: 83; see also Greene 1972: 71 For OI, see the discussion, from a diachronic-reconstructive point of view, Watkins 1963: 43ff.). Synchronically speaking, I find it is the pragmatic-functional act-of-speech angle here that is basic and definitive, namely the dialogic quality common to both, the imperative in the allocutive, the second in the reactive subsystems of dialogue. I find significant in this connection the fact that *na(c)-* serves also in allocation as confirmation-seeking or checking tag, or even as an interrogative reaction, alongside *oni(d)-*, esp. in negative questions—as it were self-responding, or as anticipated response.[128]

2. J. Baudiš considered both imperative and 'answer forms' emphatic utterance forms, and correlated this quality with the 'absence of particle' (Baudiš 1916: 112); and indeed, he has a point: both are rhematic, on the ultra-clausal functional level. See below, 3.3.2–3, on the rhematicity of the responsive and performative; the latter has much in common with the imperative as an illocutionary speech-act.[129]

3. *Nac* is hypostatised for 'negative answer' (*Culhwch ac Olwen* 1040).[130]

3.3.1. a[int]: allocative signal of nexal question; a- + verbal nexus, existential and adverbial-statal nexus; a-y-(a-e-) + noun-rheme nexus, constituent nexus or focalizing nexus

Like the responsive (3.3.2), *a-* marks a clause as texteme component, incomplete on its own.[131] The interrogation type signalled by this converter is (in Jespersen's term) that of a nexal question, paraphrasable as 'Is the nexus between (X and Y) valid?' It is therefore, properly speaking, indifferent to the opposition *affirmative* vs. *negative* (in convenient phrasing, it is 'affirmative only'; see 3.3.1.1 for *pony(t)-*).

Observations

1. I refrain from applying here the distinction of 'rhetorical' vs. 'real' questions, which I consider to be extrinsic, aprioristic and thus alien to the formal demarcations of the linguistic system described, which alone are of relevance to a decoding analysis. When an *a-*convertered or otherwise formally marked allocutive clause has a subsequent response or reaction, it constitutes a component of a specific, clearly defined grammatical pattern; when it is not followed by such, it constitutes a component of another pattern. Whether or not either is meant for eliciting information or for request or demand, for deliberation, speculation, musing, emphatic statement or exclamation of the locutor's view, must, in default of the rich superasegmental signal cluster which accompanies the allocutions of

[128] See Wagner 1959: 230f.; *GPC* 2545, *na*[2], *nac*[1] (3). Some ModW exx. from Islwyn Ffowc Elis and Alun Jones: *'Dydi Ellen ddim yn enw call iawn ar ddyn, nac ydi?* 'Eileen is not a very sensible name for a boy, is it?', *Ond mae tair blynedd yn amser hir i fecso. Nag ych chi'n meddwl 'ny, Martha?* 'But three years is a long time to worry. Don't you think so, Martha?', *A pham rych chi'n staran arna' i fel rych chi? Oes cyrn yn tyfu ar 'y mhen i? Nag ych chi'n gweld y picil 'rwy' ynddo?* 'And why are you staring at me like you are? Are there horns growing on my head? Don't you see the pickle I'm in?'. Affirmative response pro-forms are also used as tags: *Do-(fe)*, *Ie-(fe)*.

[129] See Lyons 1977 Chapter 16.

[130] Cf. Coptic *nmon*, *mpo*, *nno*—'no' with a (respectively) present, preterite, modal future temporal component, all three also proclitically used (with agent and verb lexeme) for the respective tense-forms.

[131] Cf. Gagnepain 1967: 6.

spoken language, be gathered from all co(n)textual data enveloping it. 'Will you step into the bath?' (PKM 87) is, in all probability, a request or polite invitation, to be followed by any of a virtually open-ended paradigm of linguistic or pragmatic reaction forms: refusal, reluctance, embarrassment, compliance (verbal and/or pragmatic), uncertainty, astonishment... However, once the response or, more broadly, the reaction is given, and only then, the dialogic value of the 'question', barring deeper layers of meaning, is resolvable. Of the examples below, some clearly do not await an answer, many do, and for the some this query is purely speculative. And, in fact, interrogative allocutivity and responsivity properties are compatible:

—*Pa-geluydyt...a gymerwn ni arnam?* 'What craft shall we undertake?' (allocation)

—*Gwnawn taryaneu* 'Let us make shields' (formally, an allocution—yet responsive to the foregoing)

—*A wdom ninheu dim y wrth hynny*? 'Do we know anything about this?' (i.e. 'We don't know...: allocution/response)

—*Ni a'y prowwn* 'We'll try it' (i.e. 'No, but...': response) (PKM 53).

I find 'nexal' the best characterization (and definition) of this type of interrogative clause, and (as is well known) both Welsh and Irish certainly bring interrogation and nexus (formally represented by the copula) into a formal association. 'Yes/No' as a description of this type of question I consider inadequate, especially with reference to the whole allocution-response text-grammatical complex ('The time has come to shake off the spell of the term yes-no. It may help observe that an answer to a so-called yes-no question can have any shade of confirmation that lies across the spectrum from absolute plus to absolute minus', D. Bolinger 'Yes-No Questions Are Not Alternative' in: H. Hiz (ed), *Questions*, 1978, Dordrecht-Boston:Reidel, 87–105, p.103).

2. When interrogation is segmentally unmarked in the allocution, it is formally (retrospectively) marked by the response: (PKM 87) '*Ti a ey y'r ennein, Argluyd?—heb hi. Af yn llawen—heb ef.* Still, this is a question semantically different from *a-* questions, as regards the information-rate coutour (or 'Communicative Dynamism'): it is a question very tightly anchored in the pragmatic context and of very low (or slow) CD[132] (in the passage quoted: Blodeuedd had prepared the bath and the frame, and asks the question—indeed, makes a suggestion—for enacting the precise scenario she and Lleu had gone over earlier (*ibid.* 'And will you show me how you would stand on the edge of the tub and the he-goat, if I prepare the bath?'). On the other hand, *a*-questions cover the middle to high range of Communicative Dynamism.

Syntactic properties: (1) The response to the *a-* questions is either affirmative or negative,[133] or 'absent', no response at all (see above); (2) I find no instance of co-ordinated or disjoined questions. (3) Compatibilities: with verbal nexus, the tense in the interrogative clause is in our corpus predominantly the aorist ('present-future') tense. This may well be due to the more general preponderance of this tense in the kind of allocution/response *Wechselrede* featured in the

[132] Cf. Greive 1974: 'intonation question' ('Tu viens?'), tightly thematic-context-bound; opposed to 'inversion-question' ('Viens-tu?'), 'thematically deepening' and accelerating the communicative progression; and to 'morpheme question' ('Est-ce que tu viens?'), thematically delimitative (initial boundary signal).

[133] Thus, '*num*' as translation of *a-* (Pedersen 1913:748) is unsatisfactory.

Mabinogi; but the question still needs special study. Interrogative *a-* seems to be incompatible with the lexeme aspect premodifier *ry-* (par. 5 below), a restriction the implications of which I find it difficult to understand. In the case of interrogative focalizing nexus, adverbial foci are the rule; *a-* does not normally occur with the adverbial nexus pattern (yet see below, Obs (4)), but is compatible with existential statements.

Observation

3. Outside dialogic exchange proper, nexal questions occur in included status, as governed object actants (*alias*, 'whether...' indirect questions)[134] of a well-defined lexeme class: *gofyn* 'ask', *edrych* 'look', *guybot* 'find out' (P 344, B 451f., O 226, 683), The only formal distinction between this functional slot and the allocutive one is the referential cohesive one, *viz.* the anaphoric delocutive pronoun ('he'/'she'/'they') here, as opposed to a truly commuting full range personal pronoun ('I, you, he...') in 'direct questions'.[135]

(a) *a-* + verbal or existential nexus

(PKM 87) *Ac a dangossy di ymi pa-furu y sauut ti ar emyl y gerwyn a'r bwch...? (-Dangossaf)* 'And will you show me how you would stand on the edge of the tub and the he-goat...?' (—'I will'). (similar cases: P 280f., B 33, PKM 86, O 505 etc.)

(P 380) *Eneit—heb y Gwawl—a uyd llawn dy-got-ti uyth?* (—'It will not...').

(B 265) *A welewch chwi dim namyn hynny? (—Gwelem, arglwyd,—heb wy—mynyd mawr...)* 'Did you see anything but this?' (—'We saw, Lord', they said, 'a big mountain...'). A rare instance of the imperfect tense, eliciting narrative information, with the response echoing the question.

(PKM 88f.) *A was—heb ef— a doeth dy hwch di heno y mywn? (—Doeth)* 'Oh, lad' he said, 'has your sow come in tonight?' (—'She has'). A rare instance of the preterite.

(O 627) *A ces varch ac arueu y'r iarlles? (—Oes)* 'Does the Lady have a horse and arms?' (—'She has').

Observation

4. (B 261–2) *Duw a rodo da ywch—heb ef—a chwedleu genhwch* (W; R *a chwedleu y gennwch* is, I believe, interrogative, yet with no formal marking of either interrogative or existential (*a oes-*, is the interrogative conversion allomorph of existential and statal *mae*: cf. B 412f. *A oes gennwch chwi chwedleu*); nor, if it is not existential, an interrogative rheme (as in PKM 71 *Pa-chwedleu yssyd yma* 'What news is there?'). Ed's note (p.32) sums up the perplexity: '*a-* here can hardly be the interrogative particle; the context seems to require a question, but the syntax is difficult. R resolves the difficulty by writing a *chwedleu y gennwch*, to be translated 'and stories from (*y gan*) you' i.e. "let us have your news". The literal translation of W's reading is "and tidings with you"'. And yet the evidence points to the validity of this construction: (O242ff.) (The Lady to Lunet) '*Chwedleu o lys Arthur gennyt?—Goreu chwedyl gennyf*' 'You have news from Arthur's court?'—'I have the best of news' (contrast the response to the full existential question: B 413 *nac oes...onyt...* 'There is not, unless...')[136] The same construction occurs twice in *Culhwch ac Olwen* (115f) *Chwedleu porth genhyt?—Yssydynt genhym* 'You have gate-news?' 'I have' (also 779). The response here clearly shows the essentially existential nature of the

[134] For instance, cf. Richards 1970:115, 121f., 124f.

[135] The query whether the 'indirect' or 'direct' question was the original function (e.g. Morris-Jones 1913: 425) is therefore properly speaking an etymological one, and so possibly unanswerable, since at the reconstructive levels it is near-impossible to oppose degrees of syntaxic (inter)dependence.

allocutive utterance. I would correlate the absence of *oes* (*mae*) with the tone of urgency or impatience which is signalled as associated with this prompting, and the absence of interrogative marking with the special information-rate contour (above, Obs.2). (*A-* I take to be the homonym 'and'; we find it in fact coordinating another formulaic pompting allocution consisting of a possessed noun, in precisely the same context but in a different (pragmatic) context, as polite request: (PKM 62) *Duw a ro da it, heb y Manawydan, a'th uendith* 'God give you good', said Manawydan, 'and your blessing!'. In Middle Irish too[137] we find an almost exact lexical, functional-morphological and syntactic precise equivalent, viz. *Scéla lat* (king to subordinates), translated either as 'Do you have news?' (so *Contributions* 'S' 84, with further reff.: or 'What news have you?' (O'Rahilly, *Táin* 1512, Rec. I 1212)—supporting the existential-statal-possessive interpretation of our text.

(b) *a-* with noun-rheme nexus, constituent nexus or focalizing nexus (almost only adverbial foci in the Four Branches):
(PKM 86) *A-wyt iach di?* 'Are you well?' (sim. 77).
(PKM 86) *Ae diogel hynny?* (—*Diogel, dioer*) 'Is this sure?' ('Yes it is ['Sure'], God knows').
(O 227) *Ae amser ynni vynet y'r byrdeu?* (—*Amser*) 'Is it time for us to go to the tables?' (—'Yes it is' ['Time']).
(PKM 69) *Ae gwell y gwna neb vy neges?* (—*Na well*) 'Is it better, that anyone will perform my errand?', i.e. 'Will anyone perform...better?' (—'No it is not' ['Not better']). (P 451f.) *Ay kyscu yd wyt ti?* (—*Nac ef*) 'Is it asleep you are?' (—'Not so') (B 70f.) *Ay yvelly y gwnaethant wy am uorwyn kystal a honno?* 'Is it thus they act about a maiden as excellent as this? (sim. P 441)—no response.
(B 451f.) ...*e wybot ay gwir a dywedir am hynny* '...to know whether it is true, what is said about this...'.
(O 683) *A gofyn a oruc Owein ay dyn bydawl a'y gwnaei* 'And Owein asked whether a man of this world it was that made it'.

(c) Disjunctively, with (noun, pronoun or adverb) constituent nexus, as an special case of included actantial question: (P 395) ...*ae a'e droet ae a throssawl* (Everyone struck a blow) 'either with his ('their') foot or with a stick'.
(B 174) ...*ae uyg kyuoeth ae wynt* (My subjects gave me a choice) 'either my subjects, or they'.
(PKM 91) ...*a uynnei ae tir ae dayar ae eur ae aryant am y sarhaet* 'Whether he wanted either land or territory or gold or silver for his insult'.

Observation

5. the disjunction *ae-... ae-...* is negatived as *na(c)... na(c)...* ('neither...nor...:P 157ff ...*na digrifwch, nac ymdidan, nac ymchwelut ohonot dy wyneb attaf i...*'...neither pleasure, nor conversation, nor turning tour face to me...', B 286 *na llong na llestyr* 'neither ship, nor boat' PKM 51 *na heldir well, nac amlach y mel na'y physcawt* '...nor better hunting-ground, nor one more plentiful of its honey or fish', also *ibid.* 53, 54, 56, 58, 64). This is also the negative responsive characteristic (below, 3.2), and, as was pointed out above, occurs also in ModW in tag-questions.[138] Thus, we observe for disjunctive/coordinative constituent nexus a functional conflation (or neutralization) of the allocution:response opposition:

[136] It seems that *nac oes...onyt...* alternates with *nit oes...namyn* (B 293f., 316, O 58, 82 etc.).
[137] See D.S. Thomson's Gaelic parallel, *Branwen* p.32).
[138] Also in alternative questions: *Ydach chi'n teimlo bod yna rym yn y ddadl gomiwnyddol, ynte nac ydach?* 'Do you feel there is a force in the communist argument, or don't you?' (Islwyn Ffowc Elis).

	noun-rheme nexus	**constituent nexus**
allocution	*ae-* (aff. only)	affirm. *ae-*/ neg. *na(c)-* + constituent
response	affirm. *rheme* + *zero*	
tags	neg. *na(c)-rheme*	

3.3.1.1

Pony(t)- Negative *pony(t)-* (verbal nexus), *pony-t-* (non-verbal nexus)[139] is less common and functionally quite dissimilar to *a-*. The semantics of 'affirmative' interrogation are complicated enough, and that of 'negative' interrogation compoundly so: the negator component may serve to focus an affirmative nexus or a nexus-component, in commutation or conjointly with focalizing constructions. Examples in our corpus are either 'rhetorical'—emphatic or indignant assertions—or suggestions, never information-eliciting:

(P 556) *Ponyt oed da i ti, arglwyd, ...peri y hywedu...?* 'Wouldn't it be advisable for you, lord, to cause it to be broken in...?' (sim. PKM 73, O 219).

(PKM 63) *Ponyt llygoden...a welaf i y'th law di?* 'Isn't it a mouse that I see in your hand?' (following '[I am] hanging a thief I caught thieving...').

(O 187) *Pony wydut ti nat edewis y gawat hediw na dyn na llwdyn yn vyw...?* 'Don't you know that the rain-shower has left today neither man nor beast alive?'.

3.3.2 # zero converter...#: the response

A *zero* morph converts a verbal nexus or noun-rheme nexus as a marked form in the reaction or response sub-unit of dialogue, following its allocution: typically nexal questions, but also often other forms of allocution. In negative responses, *na(c)*[140] converts a nexus (or part thereof). To allocutions with non-verbal nexus (e.g. noun-rheme and focalizing nexus), the affirmative response is the rheme (nominal or adverbial) alone, with the theme zeroed.

Morphosyntactic and syntactic properties: (1) the responsive is the first component of the responding clause. (2) The responsive is not coordinated or concatenated. (3) The tense converted by zero is as a rule the aorist (3.3.0.1); yet here it is a thematic tense, repeating an aorist in the allocution (with rare exceptions: imperfect and perfect). (4) Its agent is usually the 1st singular, but also, less commonly, the 1st plural and third singular: again, a thematic person, invariably repeating, resuming or reflecting the agent-person in the allocution. (5) For most allocution types, the lexeme as a rule repeats the allocution lexeme (hence, thematic lexeme).[141] The rhematic element in the responsive syntagm is therefore the nexus alone: rhematic nexus—a nexal response to a nexal question. In the case of non-verbal nexus it is the (nominal or adverbial) rheme alone that constitutes the responsive clause, with the theme zeroed.

(6) Other allocution elements zeroed in the response are actants and existants (P 208, 470f., B 512, O 697, 703f.)

[139] *ae ny-, a-nyt-* is not documented in our corpus (Simon Evans 1964:106).

[140] Remarkably, the pre-consonant allomorph *na-* occurs also before vowel-morphemic juncture: *na'i-*.

[141] 'Lexeme', in a systemic sense, allowing for suppletive personal alternants, like *dos* 'go!' and *af* 'I'll go'. Note that *zero* in the responsive may also simultaneously be a factor of non-actualization as well as of cohesion.

Observations

1. For the term 'responsive' ('atebol') see Wagner 1959: 223ff. Calvert Watkins 1963: 43ff., Greene 1972; Wagner and Dressler 1972: 161ff.; Arwyn Watkins 1988 (e.g. 11, used for a functional, not formal reference), Ó Siadhail 1989 (e.g. 245–249). Earlier treatments are Strachan 1909 par. 241f., Pedersen 1913 parr. 548, 552. Simon Evans 1964: 176ff. does not use special terminology.

David Greene's special discussion is the most comprehensive and detailed; Ó Siadhail 1973 is an important account of responsive clauses in Modern Irish dialects, with a precise outline of distribution as well as theoretical and pragmatic-communicative insights: one would wish for a similar study for Welsh, although C. H. Thomas 1974: 281ff. is an adequate first step in this direction. I cannot agree with Greene that we have in the responsive a case of deletion (66), or that this makes it basically a pausa form, like the imperative (71), whether or not the form is 'archaic' or 'older' (66, 71f.)—basically a diachronic statement. (Like most discussions of *na(c)-*, Greene's is mainly comparative-reconstructive-diachronic. In fact, Greene follows in most of these points Calvert Watkins 1963). I use 'responsive' in both its primary and secondary dictionary meanings (OED 'response' 1a, b; 'respond' 3c): it often follows non-interrogative clauses, and indeed it constitutes the very exponent of marking them as allocutions.

2. The responsive and allocutive substructures of the dialogue are remarkably asymmetrical, and indeed they prove to be compatable: this is the second basic pattern asymmetry we encounter, the first being that of the affirmative and negative clause systems. However, the allocution/response asymmetry is syntagmatic, and concerns two mutually compatible and complementary subsystems. The text-grammar of the [allocution + response] complex is far from simple, involving numerous complex patterns, and cannot be described here in full. Let me point out (a) the cohesive value of the zeroing of (pro)nominal elements and thematizing repetitions/reflection of tense, lexemes and agent;[142] (b) the rhematic status of the responsive nexus, already referred to. Indeed, the response constituent is typically rhematic—in the *Wechselrede* extent—to the allocution theme, which makes the latter kindred in that sense to the protatic ('if' etc.) clause, which is equally thematic to the apodosis rheme;[143] (c) the different agent-expression characteristics in the allocution and response (see Obs.5 below); (d) the essentially valential-rectional nature of the [question + answer] and, more generally, [allocution + response] interdependence: various allocutions govern certain types of response.

3. Note the following ModW instances proving the compatibility of allocutivity and responsivity (from Islwyn Ffowc Elis, Alun Jones): *''Does 'na ddim gwahaniaeth rhwng llofruddio dyn da a llofruddio dyn drwg'.—'Nac oes 'na? Nac oes 'na'n wir?'* 'There is no difference between murdering a good man and murdering a bad man'. 'Isn't there? Isn't there really?'; the compatibility of the responsive with narrativity, in the 'omniscient narrator's' channel, a special type of 'style indirecte libre': *''Wn i mo'r cyfan'—Na wyddai...* 'I don't know the whole'—he didn't know...' *''Does arna'i ddim eisiau bod yn enwog'—Nac oedd, wrth gwrs.* '"I do not need to be famous"—He didn't, of course'. *A allai ef fod yn y parti pen-blwydd? Gallai, gyda*

[142] Halliday and Hasan 1976: 206ff. It is still an open question whether in Welsh it would be correct to state that 'La réponse totale ne diffère pas prosodiquement de la simple information' (Frei 1968:9).

[143] See Shisha-Halevy 1981.

llawer o ddiolch 'Could he come to the birthday party? He could, with lots of thanks' (contrast the non-responsive, but highlighting answer in *A allai Mr. Arthur wneud cymaint mewn amser mor fyr? Fe wnâi'i orau* 'Could Mr. Arthur do so much in so short a time? He would do his best'; the syntagmatic compatibility of the responsive with non-responsive (a distinction lost in the English translation): *"Rwyt ti'n mynd i saethu un o'r rhain, Heilyn' 'Nac ydw, Marian, 'dydw i ddim'* 'You're going to shoot one of those, Heilyn'.—'I am not, Marian, I am not.' Consider also *'Wnewch chi mo'i thorri hi'.—'Wna'i? Gwnaf.'* 'You won't break it'—'Won't I? I will', where the responsive joins an echo question.

4. The typological and comparative significance of this phenomenon[144] has been pointed out by Wagner in a discussion (Wagner 1959: 222ff.) which, typically, is also (or even primarily) descriptively fresh and penetrating. According to Wagner (see esp.224; Wagner and Dressler 1972: 170), the response is 'subordinated' to the question, which serves as its 'prefix'. I accept this analysis, though in a purely formal sense: the question replaces the converter, which is accordingly zeroed, as formal theme, which in turn marks the response as rheme.

5. I do not find in Mabinogi MW the opposition postulated by Greene (Greene 1972: 67f.; see also Greene 1973: 128, Henry 1973: 38ff.) between 'emphatic' and 'unemphatic' responsives, the former marked by the addition of the so-called affixed (auxiliary enclitic) pronoun, which would be '*gwelaf-i*' vs. *gwelaf* (Irish *scriobh sé* vs. *scríobh*), in which, according to Greene's definition (loc.cit.), 'it is the action which is stressed, not the agent'. I suppose it is yet again the nexus which Greene has in mind as the stressed (focused) component. The difference between emphatic and non-emphatic responsives is, I suggest, not in degree of stress (or 'polemic'—antithetic emphasis) but in expectation: 'Yes, he did write', 'Doch, er schrieb', 'sí (che) ha scritto' rather than 'he wrote'. In any case, in our type of MW the agent exponent in the responsive—unlike the allocution, where the verb as a rule does have a complex pronominal agent exponent—is always simple, without the 'affixed' or 'auxiliary' pronouns (see Mac Cana 1975/6: 322f.).

6. The explanation (description? characterization? definition?) of the 'responsive' phenomenon in Celtic by reference to a so-called 'echo tendency' or 'echo system'[145] is essentially tautological, and applies—even if as one of several options in a 'responsive paradigm'—to so many languages (Greek and Latin, Biblical Hebrew, Arabic, Amharic, Italian are some I am familiar with) that it becomes trivial; all the more so, since we see that the responsive is not the only response option in Celtic.

7. While paradigmatically equivalent to zero, *na(c)-*, synchronically a 'dialogic negator' really indifferent to the allocution/response distinction (considering its allocutive and constituental use, see above, 3.3.1 with Obs. 5)[146] poses an entirely different set of diachronic questions. Its analogues diachronic association with *na(t)-* opens the way to seeing

[144] Comparable categories are known in Berber (Wagner 1959:223) and in Modern Nubian, where the distinction 'apocritic' *vs.* 'anapocritic' is basic to the conjugation system (Armbruster 1960: par.4608, also 4488, 6102, 6180 and *passim*); Gerald Browne of the University of Illinois informs me of special Cleft-Sentence-like focussing constructions (with *-lo*, 'it is') in the response slot in Old Nubian. For Amharic responsive parallels, see Goldenberg 1966:3f., 55f. etc., and systematically Kapeliuk 1968 parr. 33–69 with special responsive morphology, particles, lexemic configurations etc.

[145] See for instance Sadock and Zwicky 1985: 191.

[146] In two instances I believe this responsive negator was misconstrued by Sir Ifor Williams (PKM 7.15, 50.2, see notes pp.115, 229) who interpreted it as explicative '*am na-*'.

dependence as the common factor between substantival nexus ('that not...') and responsives (see for instance Pedersen 1913: 239f., 257, merging *na(c)-* and *na(t)-* in the treatment; Baudiš 1916: 113); however, this seems hardly relevant or evan tenable synchronically.

8. The responsive form is sometimes followed by a semi-grammaticalized emphatically asseverative phrase:[147] *Dioer* 'God knows', 'by God' (PKM 86); *y rof i a Duw* 'between me and God' (P 281, 442). These phrases are initial when not answering nexal questions (e.g. P 33, 177, 288, B 92, 99, O 26, 391, 394, 408).

9. While the responsive is not the only form occurring in response clauses following nexal questions, special questions or imperatives, it is evidently the marked term in the paradigm, which also features (to choose the striking members):

'Ys gwir' 'truly' (O 684), (see above, 3.2).

neu- focused nexus (see above, 3.1).

infinitives (O 686)[148]

Focalization and presentative nexus patterns (the Abnormal Sentence and Cleft Sentence: P 332, PKM 53, 85 (R; W has the responsive), PKM 86, O 410).[149]

Negative verb forms (PKM 77).

Llyma-cataphoric response (e.g. P 52, 178, B163f., PKM 56 etc.)

10. The responsive is used in ModW as a reaffirming element in (Islwyn Ffowc Elis) *Yr oedd yn caru Greta, oedd* 'He loved Greta, he really did', different from the nexus focusing *oedd, yr oedd.*

Documentation (selective; principal configuration and representative examples):

(a) nexal questions answered by the responsive:

(P 280f.) (*Arglwydes—heb ef—a dywedy di y mi dim o'th negessau?*)—*Dywedaf* ('Lady' he said, 'Will you tell me something of your errands?') 'I will.'

(P 380) (*Eneit—heb y Gwawl—a uyd llawn dy-got-ti uyth?*)—*Na uyd...* ('My soul' said Gwawl, 'Will your bag ever be full?') 'It will not...'.

(B 265) (*A welewch chwi dim namyn hynny?*)—*Gwelem, arglwyd,—heb wy—mynyd mawr...*) ('Did you see anything but that?')—'We saw, Lord;' they said, 'a big mountain...'. An exceptional case, this is a 'narrative question', with the imperfect in allocution, eliciting narrative information, and response. Cf. PKM 88f. for the 3rd-person preterite in allocution and response.

(B 33) (*A uyn ef dyuot y'r tir?*)—*Na uynn* 'Does he wish to come on land?')—'He does not'. An untypical case of third-person allocution and response.

(O 627) (*A oes varch ac arueu y'r iarlles?*)—*Oes* ('Does the Lady have a horse and arms?') 'She has'.

(PKM 86) (*A wney ditheu...menegi ymi...?*)—*Dywedaf yn llawen* ('Will you tell me...?)—'I will say gladly'; note the remarkable use of auxilary *gwneuthur* 'do' in the question and the partial overlap of *menegi* and *dywedut.*

(PKM 86) (*Ae diogel hynny?*)—*Diogel, dioer* ('Is this sure?') 'Sure, God knows'.

(O 227) (*Ae amser ynni vynet y'r byrdeu?*) *Amser* ('Is it time for us to go to the tables?') 'Yes it is ' ['Time'].

(P 442) (*Ay velly y mynny di, Arglwyd?*)—*Velly, y rof i a Duw* ('Is it thus you wish, lord?')—'Thus, between me and God'.

[147] See Ó Siadhail 1989: 328 for the same phenomenon in Irish, in a different religious-cultural ethos.

[148] Cf. Wagner 1959: 229. In ModW, there is a class of peculiarly dialogic infinitives: *gobeithio, credu, coelio, cytuno* and others.

[149] See Mac Cana 1991: 64–70.

(PKM 69) (*Ae gwell y guna neb vy negas?*)—*Na well* ('Is it better that anyone will perform my errand?', i.e. 'will anyone perform...better?')—'No it is not' ['Not better'].

(b) Non-nexal ('special') questions answered by the responsive:

(P 154f.) (*Pa-achaws na dywedy di wrthyf i?*)—*Dywedaf wrtht* ('Why will you not speak to me?') 'I will say to you...'.

(O 412f.) (*Pa-fford y gallaf i hynny*)—*Managaf* ('How can I do this?') 'I will tell'.

(PKM 61) (...*a phaham y gouynhei di, Arglwyd?*)—*Na weleis neut-seith mlyned un dyn yma* ('...and why do you ask, lord?) 'I have not seen a single man here these seven years'.

(c) Imperative allocution with the response (still homolexematic) expressing compliance or refusal;

(P 293) (*Guna yr oet*)—*Gunaf, Arglwyd...blwydyn y heno* ('Set the appointment') 'I set it, lord, ...a year from tonight'.

(PKM 63) (*Gollwng ef*)—*Na ellynghaf* ('Release it') 'I shall not' (Also P 384.)

(d) The responsive as a reaction form for formally declarative 'indicative' allocutions:

(P 181f.) (*Nys attygy y gennym, ot gwnn*)—*Nac attygaf, y rof i a Duw* ('You will not take it back from us, I trust') 'I shall not, between me and God'.

(PKM 87) (*Ti a ey y'r ennein?*) *Af yn llawen* ('You will go into the bath?') 'I'll go, gladly' (see above, 3.3.1 Obs.2).

(PKM 80) (*Eres yw genhyf na uedrut gymedroli...*)—*Na medreis. Mi a'y medraf weithon* ('It's strange to me that you could not hit the middle...') (I could not; I can do it now'.

O 395) (*Y rof i a Duw... ni allwn i vyth ennill vy arglwyd i o dyn arall yn y byt—Gallut...gwrha gur a vei gystal ac ef...* ('Between me and God... I could never make good the loss of my lord by any other man in the world') 'You could...marry a man as good as him'.

Cf. also PKM 62–64, with the answer *'Na wynhaf'* to various forms of offer.

3.3.2.1 Nac ef

The negative pro-response reaction form to various allocution forms, with the aorist or durative present tense, is *nac ef* (e.g. P 535, PKM 53., 58), in which *ef* is the nexus representant—the 'pro-allocution' form as represented in the response—but simultaneously also an obligatory support for *nac* (which does not occur alone);[150] this opens the way to further explanation or suggestion:

(P 535f.) (*Ay kyscu yd wyt ti?*)—*Nac ef... Mi a gyskeis...* ('Is it asleep you are?') 'No;...I was asleep...'.

(PKM 58) (*Pam y diodeuir hynn gan y tayogeu?*)—*Nac ef... ni a aem eissoes y Dyuet* ('Why do we suffer this ("is this suffered") from the villains?') 'No; we had better go to Dyfed'. Also PKM 53, 54.

3.3.3 # zero converter + 1st singular aorist #: performative ('Koinzidenzfall')

A zero-converted 1st-person-singular aorist form is used in MW to express the special type of act-of-speech which simultaneously states and effects the execution of an action:

(PKM 87) *Diolchaf y Duw hynny* '*I thank* God for this'.

[150] 'Nexual negation' is Wunderli's term (Wunderli 1975). Our MW does not have an affirmative pro-response form.

(PKM 73,79) *Dygaf y Duw vyg-kyffes*: oath formula: '*I bring* my avowal to God'; consider here two non-performative focalizing alternants: *I Duw y dygaf...*, (P 166f., B 361, PKM 91), *a'm kyffes a dygaf ytti* (O 199).
(PKM 85) *Dywedaf hagen wot yn perigyl dyuot yr unben bieu y llys adref* ('...I shall not go.) Still, I say there is danger of the gentlemen, whose court this is, coming home'.

Observations

1. As is well known, the term 'performative' and its first systematic conceptual-semantic analysis is J. L. Austin's (Austin 1962, esp. 6, 61ff., 67ff. etc.). The notion and grammatical phenomenon are highly complex, and have acquired a considerable importance in semantic and language-philosophical discussion.[151] In the grammar-oriented context, the term is used either *stricto* or *lato sensu*: the 'proper' explicit performative verbal clause ('utterance') is pragmatically definable as the full and precise identity and coincidence—in time and especially in act—of linguistic form and extralinguistic performance (bypassing in a sense and, as it were, short-circuiting the tension between signifier and signified). In the broad sense, the form is either 'utterance-synchronous'—stating 'in real time' what is being performed—rather than truly performative; or else, what Austin sees as a sub-category subsumed under a 'performative' overhead class, the 'expositional performatives': 'expounding of views, conducting of arguments, clarifying of usages and references' (Austin 1962: 85, 160). To my knowledge, the only special grammar-oriented treatment of this phenomenon is Erwin Koschmieder's brilliant descriptive and comparative essay (Koschmieder 1945), focusing on the Turkish aorist and comparatively other 'aorist' tenses (e.g. German and Greek)[152] and therefore more relevant for our purpose. Koschmieder defines (26ff.) the category as 'the coincidence of utterance and act' ('Koinzidenzfall' is his term for it, a term which, developed in a German-speaking grammatical rather than anglophone philosophical context, has not won general recognition), and explicitly rejects the broader conception, while formally and functionally presenting (30f., 50ff.) the whole semantic spectrum for defining aoristic or extratemporal tense forms (again, his term; see p.55ff.)

2. A comparable category in Old Irish has, I believe, been misconstrued by David Greene (Greene 1972: 60: the form used for 'solemn statements', expressing 'emotional reflexes', the latter after Draak): it is indeed conjunct in OI (i.e. a 'conversion-base' form), but attributing this to 'pausa treatment' (*ibid.*, 60 And 65) is rather begging the question than synchronically explanatory. Similarly Sims-Williams 1984: 172 ('Solemn formulae... asseverations, with present meaning verging on future: "I *am* going, I *am* bearing"') and Eska 1991: 85 appear to miss the vital point: it is not the matter of 'emphatic semantics', synchronically speaking, but of a rhematic text-grammatical function.

3. There is a tenuous yet sharp difference between the *stricto sensu* performative and the responsive in cases like (PKM 50) or (O 765) *...pei mynnewch—Mynnwn* 'If you wished...'—'We do' (see above, 3.3.0.1), on the one hand, and between (PKM 85) *dywedaf hagen* 'Still, I

[151] See for instance Lyons 1977: 728ff., 643, 778ff. etc.; Sbisa 1981; Sadock and Zwicky 1985: 157f., with further references.

[152] The Greek aorist has of course a similar role: Gildersleeve 1980 parr. 254, 262; Debrunner 1930: 10-13: '*emempsamên, epêinesa*'. For Coptic, see below, n....; in Old and Middle Egyptian the 'aorist' *sdm.n.f* form is used in this role, see Gunn 1924: 69ff.

say...' (perf., quoted above)—present time indication—and (*ibid.*) *dywedaf yn llawen* 'I shall tell gladly', with the future indication of the aorist echoing the future in the preceding interrogative allocution, on the other. *Mi a dynghaf dyghet* (PKM 79, 81, 83) is not performative, but future. 'I shall cast (him) a destiny'; contrast the performative *tynghaf tynghet* 'I cast a destiny' in *Culhwch ac Olwen* 50. Moreover, the ('parenthetical') expositives are in Welsh formally different to the performatives, in that they are not restricted to the 1st person singular: (P87) *...a'r iarll—debygei ef—o'r parth arall* '...and the earl, (or so) he thought, on the other side', (B 271) *Beth—dybygy di—yw...* 'What, do you suppose, is...'.

It is illuminating to compare the two zero-conversion clause forms, responsive and performative. The former is integrated in both cotextual and contextual (pragmatic) boundness, the latter solely in contextual integration (contextually 'absolute', in a manner of speaking). What is common to both on the Functional Sentence Perspective level of analysis is the property of rhematicity in the textual (ultra-clause) extent.[153]

Observation

4. There are instances where the resolution between responsive (future) and 'synchronous present' performative is difficult or impossible: (P 272) ('...wait for me!')—*Arhoaf yn llawen* 'I'll wait gladly'/'I wait, gladly' (*arhoaf* in B 310f. is clearly future). (P 293) (*Guna yr oet*)—*Gwnaf, Arglwyd...blwydyn y heno* ('Set the appointment')—'I set/will set it, Lord,...a year from tonight'. The case of (P 29f.) *Ny chyuarchaf i well it* is no less ambiguous: either future 'I shall not greet you', or (a difficult semantic notion) the negation of a performative: 'I do not greet you'.

3.3.3.1 Excurse: the performative in Modern Welsh

I do not know of a special descriptive discussion of this functional category in ModW. I find in my files many examples (gleaned esp. from *Y Faner*), and note that this functional group—the performative proper, the utterance-synchronous, the 'expositive' present, modals—seems to define the predominant use of the aorist (the '*-af* form,' *alias* 'present'): *amheuaf* 'I doubt', *casglaf* 'I gather', *credaf* 'I believe', *cofiaf* 'I remember', *teimlaf* 'I feel', *ofnaf* (I find *mi ofnaf* as a rare variant), *nodaf* 'I note', *gallaf ddychmygu* 'I can imagine', *mawr obeithiaf* 'I greatly hope', *ysgrifennaf hyn o articl* 'I write the present article...', *maddeuaf* 'I forgive', *estynnaf fy nghydymdeimlad* 'I extend my sympathy', etc. etc. Parenthetically, the form is lenited (see below): *...y deunydd, gredaf i, sy'n peri...* '...the matter, I believe, which causes...', *ef, goelia'i, a gychwynnodd...* 'It's he, I trust, who started...'. Some of these are negatived by *ni(d)-*: *ni chredaf* 'I don't believe', *ni wedaf* 'I don't/cannot deny', *nis gallaf yn well na dyfynnu* 'I cannot do better than quote...'.

[153] Long ago, J. Baudiš correlated an 'emphasis' semantic component with absence of particle: Baudiš 1916: 112). We have before us two kinds of verbal focus, in which the lexeme/actor nexus (the case of the responsive, where both lexeme and agent-exponent are thematic) or the lexeme alone (the performative). In Coptic, the so-called Second Tense converter, used to focalize (in Cleft Sentence patterns) a non-verbal element of the verb clause, focalizes the verb lexeme itself in a special non-durative present form used in synchronous-performative role: *e-i-mou* 'I am dying' ('It is dying I am'): Shisha-Halevy 1986:79 with n.92. In Old Egyptian the aoristic *sḏm.n.f* form, like the Coptic Second Tense a focalization form, is used for the 'synchronous present'.

3.4 Lenition

Initial lenition of a finite verb form in verbal nexus, or of its (pro)nominal predicative, marks them for discourse status or for dependence membership, or (in a different formulation) marks the entire syntagm for this dependence.

Observation

1. Among Welsh initial mutations (it must be stressed that in the Four Branches we are dealing with graphemic respresentation of mutation phenomena),[154] lenition is synchronically distinct. Of the extensive literature on the functional status of the mutations,[155] in the conversion context, I find pertinent the following statements by R. Sornicola (on OI: Sornicola 1989: 251ff., esp.254; following the observation that 'tutti i contesti sintattici elencati (i.e. as involving lenition) possono essere ridotti ad un fenomeno generale unitario, che è quello della *dipendenza sintattica*'): '[...] ne risulta un generale dispositivo di 'realizzazione' delle *relazioni di reggenza*, che marca mediante la lenizione *il secondo elemento della relazione*, indipendentemente dal suo status di elemento reggente o elemento retto. Si tratta quindi di *una strategia di tipo lineare, piuttosto che gerarchico*.' (My italics). However, in noun-rheme nexus I suggest the lenition morphoneme has medial, not second location (see 3.4.2).

2. Lenition, and in our corpus lenition only, occurs either as pertinent signal marking or as conditioned combinatory morphophonemic alternant. [156]

3. I would functionally classify the initial lenition of a noun or verb lexeme as follows:

(I) conversion roles (pertinent)

(II) juncture roles (conditioned)

(III) gender concord roles (conditioned or pertinent) (nouns only).

Under (I), I include the marking of the noun as predicative; as object actant; as of adverbial status; the marking of the verb as converted, in certain functions.

Under (II), the combinatory lenition in various compunds (following adjectives, pronominalia [incl. possessive articles], some numbers; some expansions of nuclear proper names, see [5] below, etc.), following prepositions; len. of the verb following some converters and all junctors.

Under (III), nouns (substantives and adjectives) are lenited in attributive and/or appositive concord to a feminine noun (or definite article).

4. While lenition here is clearly a tagmemic feature of agreement, I still find category (III) difficult to describe. One can think of two possible models that would be consistent with the facts even if flawed to a degree: (a) two homonymous def. article morphs, 'y$^{fem.}$' and 'y$^{masc.}$', always nuclear, concord with conditioned femine and masculine substantive-lexeme allomorphs respectively. These in turn concord, if expanded, with feminine and masculine adjective

[154] Further corpus-based investigation is needed, for instance, to verify the impression that distinct lenition roles have distinct qualitative and quantitative graphemic distributional properties. The different combinatory morphemic and syntactic categories of lenition are an important factor in the pervasive impression of orthographical *variance*: *bu* 'he/she was', for instance, appears to have different 'graphemic lenition' properties from other [*b*-] forms; the lenition following the 3rd sgl. masc. possessive article is graphemically marked more often than others; and so on.

[155] See (to mention only some structuralist special discussions) Hamp 1957, Kuryłowicz 1961, Øftedal 1962, Ellis 1986, Thorne 1984.

[156] 'Inherent', 'sefydlog' are terms used in the literature for my 'pertinent'; 'retrospective', 'trosglwyddiadol' for the combinatory cases.

allomorphs.[157] However, to account for the lenition in '*Ø-pont fawr*' we still need to postulate feminine adjectival allomorphs conditioned by 'feminine' nuclear substantives, the latter definable as 'the lexeme class compatible with the femine definite article'. This analysis is therefore 'closed' and circular to a degree, as well as uneconomic. (b) An alternative model postulates the differentiation of nuclear and satellital lexeme allmorphs. While for masculine nouns this morphosyntactic distinction is neutralized (or rather, masc. nouns are indifferent to this distinction), feminines—the marked term—have two allomorphs, viz. a basic unmutated one in nuclear status and a lenited one in satellital status (i.e. following the definite article or another fem. noun). After the zero article, however, it is the nuclear form which occurs.

5. The lenition of nouns following nuclear proper names ('*Math uab Mathonwy*'; '*Hywel dda*', '*Duw wyn*'), of proper names following status-nouns ('*Pab Ddafydd*') and certain other nuclear nouns ('*Tŷ Ddewi*')[158] is, I believe, a case of junctural lenition (type II). These are nominal compounds, some comparable to the following Vedic and esp. Sanskrit types (mostly subtypes of the *Karmadhâraya*):[159] *Madanikâ-gaṇikâ-* 'the courtezan M.' (also in a different pattern, *Ganikâ-madanikâ-*); *Garga-kula-* 'the clan of G.'; *Vîrasena-suto* 'the son of V.'; *Nala-pura-* (in a city name), '*Nala's town*'; *Maruḍ-gana-* 'Marut's band'; and the exocentric *Indra-sakhi* 'cuius socius Indra est'.

3.4.1 Lenition marking parenthetic/thematic status of the verb

(P 87) *...a'r iarll—debygei ef—o'r parth arall* '...and the earl—(or so) he thought—on the other side'.
(B 271) *Beth—dybygy di—yw kynny?* 'What do you think this is?.

Observations

1. See Morgan 1952: 450, Williams 1980: 73 (ignoring here the 'zero converter' property). Note that lenition here is a signal, not the vestige of a deleted 'overt' one (*pace* Thorne 1984: 80f.) with double coincident marking, viz. the zero conversion of the 'synchronous present' (not the *stricto sensu* performative: we have here the 2nd and 3rd person singular, the latter in narrative!) conjointly with initial lenition signalling 'parenthicality'.

2. The marking by initial lenition of parenthetic status brings to mind the adverbial—status—signalling lenition of the noun, and indeed, I believe this association is no coincidence and structurally cogent, being of theoretical as well as of typological significance. It cuts across word-class or part-of speech distinctions, the same morphemic means being for noun-case as for 'clause-case' grammar.

3.4.2 'Copular lenition': medial ('infixed') lenition marking noun-rheme nexel dependence

The lenition here, while (by 'typological coincidence') initial to the second constituent of the nexus, is structurally speaking medial ('infixed') to the nexus itself, residing either in the verbal theme (a form of <*bot*> 'be' or other thematic verb), or in the nominal rheme—respectively, as the case may be according to the Nominal Sentence patterning. It is important to realize that

[157] This is more or less E. Hamp's approach (Hamp 1951: 237).

[158] See Morgan 1952 Ch. 6 for an excellent account of these lenitions, although much study is still needed, resolving periods, genres, orthographical norms etc.

[159] See Speijer 1886: 152f. I am indebted to S. Migron for his invaluable information on Indic.

the lenition here is not junctural or 'compositional': prosodically, this nexal syntagm does not constitute a close juncture (consider for instance P 584 or 620f.).[160]

Observation

1. The nexus-medial location of the lenition morphophoneme is in a sense comparable to the medial graphemic focusing (by italics) in the adverbial-nexus pattern (see 3.2 c) *Mae o **yn** wir felly* 'It *is* true, then', *Ceridwen, peidiwch â dibynnu arna'i!—'Rydw i **yn** dibynnu arnoch chi.* 'Ceridwen, don't rely on me!'—'I *am* relying on you'. In both cases we are dealing with a copula exponent.

(a) Rheme-initial patterns:

(P 335) *...a hwnnw uyd dy attep* '...and this will be your answer'
(P 364 stc.) *...a llawen uuuyt* '...and gladly was he received'
(P 584) *Os gur muyn uyd y mab, mambmaeth ynni uyd* 'If the child be a gentle man, he will be our foster-son'
(O 117) *...a hir uu genhyf y nos honno* '...and long was that night for me'
(PKM 56f.) *Ys drwc-a-gedymdeith uuosti ac ys da-a-gedymeith a golleisti* 'A bad companion you have been, and a good companion you have lost'—note the difference between the lenition, signalling nexal status, and the relative conversion, marking the topic in a Cleft Sentence. (For *ys-* here, see above 3.2.2 (c)).

Observation

2. This again is not the substitute or vestige of the 'omission' of the relative converter a^{rel}. When the variation *uu/a-uu* does occur it is usually in the existential, not thematic <*bot*>. For the paradigm *a-uu | y bu | uu* see 5.4 below.

(b) Theme-initial patterns:

(P 550) *mab teirbluyd a uei uaur y dwf* 'A three-year-old child that is big of growth'.
(PKM 77) *A wyt uorwyn di?* 'Are you a virgin?'.
(O 781) *...tra-uu-vyw hi* 'as long as she is alive'.

Observation

3. I see no reason whatever to postulate in these and similar cases the omission of $y(n)^{len}$ (*pace* Morgan 1952: 272ff. or Simon Evans 1964: 139; see Simon Evans 1968: 237ff.).

[160] Pending further study, I do not include in the discussion cases of 'subject' actant lenition, attested in the Four Branches: see Morgan 1952, Ch. IX; Simon Evans 1964: 17f. In the lenited object actant the lenition really marks adverbal status, including also adverbal predicatives.

4. *Junctors*

4.0 Junctors

4.0.1 On junctors in general

This class of clause-presfix morphs may really be considered as constituting a connector catergory, in contradistinction to the converters, which are non-connective but mark the syntactic status of a clause. Junctors, which do not form one homogenous paradigm, are exponents of binary temporal/conditional interclausal relation[161] and simultaneously of the adverbial status of an included clause. All junctors join their clauses in close juncture, conditioning lenition.[162]

Observation

I would keep in MW the grammaticalized junctors apart from conjunctions. The latter are, properly speaking, relatively formalized syntagms of prepositions (e.g. *am*, *fel*, *er*, *megis* etc.; *hyt*, *yr*, *erbyn* are attested conjunctionally with *pan-* (*ban-*), not *y(d)-*, see 4.1), with the 'that form' *y(d)*—a phenomenon well known from Romance and Germanic (Italian *affinché*, *poiché*, *perché*, *sicché*, French *afin que*, *depuis que*, Middle English *to that*, *for that*, *whil(e) that* etc.). This is a lexically active class of adverbial-status (prepositional) phrases with a nexus constituent: 'verbal nexus marked for adverbial status'. It is noteworthy that, in Welsh as in other, non-Indo-English languages, these conjunctional syntagms are in concurrence and perhaps lexical complementary distribution with infinitival prepositional phrases with an agent expression: *guedy gorwed ohonaw ef* 'after he lay down' (B 296) (see above, 2.2).

4.1. pan[lm] / ban[lm] 'that', 'when' ('whence')

This is the most converter-like and, I find, most intriguing of all junctors. I find it difficult to accept simply the postulated evolution from the interrogative 'whence?' to 'that' (4.1.3),[163] but suggest this is a case of synchronic homonymy.

4.1.1 pan ('that')

pan$_{1}$[lm] 'that' occurs:

(a) following prepositions, with conditioned-lenition *variae lectiones*: *hyt-pan/ban-*,[164] *yr-pan* (and *o'r pan-*), *erbyn-pan-* (B 308, 336, 469, PKM 61, P 158, B 400, P 563).

[161] Cf. 'at the point of contact between two clauses' (Fleischmann 1991: 262 n.16, on Old French).

[162] Morgan 1952:376n. By ModW, junctors have moved morphosyntactically closer to each other—and to the converters: they also condition post-conversion allomorphs such as *oes*; we find *nid/nad yw*, like *pan yw*; *pan na(d)-*, like *os na(d)-*, etc.

[163] For instance Simon Evans 1964: 79f. 'originally interrogative...developed into a simple conjunction meaning 'that".

[164] Relatively rare in our corpus for 'until (the moment when...)', but common in *Culhwch ac Olwen*, where it supplies the affirmative of *hyt-na-*, the negative of *yny-* in our corpus.

(b) As theme/topic in Cleft Sentences, focalizing an *o-* ('from') prepositional phrase.[165] In the Four Branches, *pan-* occurs once, in poetic (archaic?) syntax, with the formal theme *yw-* ('it is') before a pronominal theme. The *pan*-topic Cleft Sentence pattern has two alternant constructions:

(1) # *o-...pan-...* #, in contextual independence: (PKM 89) *O ulodeu Lleu ban yw hynn* (*pan* R) 'It is from Lleu's flowers that this is', accepting here Ifor Williams's (and not W.J. Gruffydd's) reading and analysis, PKM 292. I cannot account for the lenition in W, which is neither conditioned as in (a), nor pertinent ('adverbial') as in 4.1.2 below. *Pan-yw* too is difficult in this case since, while # RHEME *yw hynn* # (that is, 'nom. rheme + formal theme + phoric pronominal theme') would be a straightforward Nom. Sentence pattern, *yw* in *Pan-yw hynn* seems to be placed enclitically—in colon-second position—and the Nom. Sentence pattern is *hynn yw* 'It's [*yw*] that [*hynn*]', 'c'est ca'.

(2) # *Pan doaf, Arglwyd, o Lloygyr o ganu* '(Whence do you come clerk?)—'It is from England, lord, that I come, from chanting'. See 3.2 Obs.2 for the topic-initial Cleft Sentence.

(c) *Pan-yw-* marks the substantival object-actant status of a delocutive Nominal Sentence, or a Cleft Sentence with *o-* ... as its focus.[166] Here *-yw-* represents the non-verbal nexus exponent after *pan-*:

(B 115f.) *Menegwch idaw pa-ryw wr wnaeth hynny a phan-yw o'm anuod inheu y gwnaethpwyt hynny ac y mae brawt un uam a mi a wnaeth hynny ac nat-hawd genhyf i na'e lad na'e diuetha* '(Tell him what kind of a man it is that did this, and that it was against my will that this was done, and that it was a brother of mine on the mother's side that did this, and that it is not easy for me to put him to death or destroy him'). This is a strikingly neat instance of nominalizer alternation, proving that *y- mae-* and *pan-yw* are regulated as conditioned allomorphs by the type of Cleft Sentence, the former for actantial, the latter for circumstantial focus, and *na-t-* for negative noun-rheme nexus.

(O 462f.) *A mi a wn yn hyspys pan-yw o ymdidan Kynon mab Clydo y kolles Owein y gennym* 'And I know clearly that it was because of Kynon mab Clydo's talk that Owein has been lost to us'.

(O 533) *...mal y hadnabu y marchawc pan-yw Gwalchmei oed* '...so that the knight knew that it was Gwalchmei'; sim. O 789.

Observation

1. In *Owein* we find *pan-* (with the preterite subjunctive) at least once used in either an 'amplificative' or 'predicative adjunct' 'that' role,[167] or else used consecutively:

(O 185f.) *Pa-drwc a digoneis i ytti pan wnelut titheu y mi...a wnaethost heddiw* 'What evil have I done to you, that you (should) have done to me what you did today?' (*Pace* ed.'s note, p.44, 'seeing that you did').

[165] The pattern is well attested in other texts, both earlier and later than ours: see examples in Morris-Jones 1913: 286, Simon Evans 1964: 79f., Arwyn Watkins 1988: 17, 22 n.4: apparently Watkins does not see these as CS cases, but as 'responsives' or 'explanatory declaratives'.

[166] See PKM 292; the construction is already attested in OW, and cf. also *Culhwch ac Olwen* 434; examples also in Richards 1940: 109f.; Simon Evans 1964: 80.

[167] A phenomenon difficult to resolve semantically yet well attested in Romance: See Tobler 1894: 112ff., 1899: 63ff., 1902: 117ff., for Old French, Serianni 1988: 480f. ('*che* generico' / 'polivalente', with further ref.), for Italian; Löfstedt 1936: 14ff. for Late Latin.

4.1.2 pan-/ban- 'when'

This occurs in three constructions:

(a) The substantival *pan-* 'that' occurs in postposed, adverbial adjunct (circumstant) status with a temporal reference. Like any substantive in adverbial status,[168] it is in this role and this position usually lenited as a signal of this very status, sometimes with an unlenited variant reading. This typically occurs in narrative, usually with the preterite, rarely the imperfect:
(B 10) *Ef a barei tangneued y rwg y deu lu ban uydynt lidyawcaf* 'He would make peace between the two hosts when they were most in strife'. Also B 396. 461f., PKM 91, (B 153, 255 have no graphemic lenition).

(b) Unmarked for adverbial status, *pan-* is anteposed, opening its clause complex as a temporal protasis, in narrative and in dialogue, with the preterite and present:
(PKM 59) *Pan doeth, ny welsei dyn wenith degach* 'When he arrived, no man (ever) saw finer wheat'. Also P 135, 591f., PKM 57, 59, 65.

(c) Perhaps most remarkably, *pan-* occurs after the narrative connective a[ac]: *a-phan-* is a well-used formalized delimitative narrative device, as it were a narrative pace-setter, marking narrative tempo—as it were, a 'resumptive step backwards and a jump forward'. This is a clause complex in which the first constituent is (in terms of narrative Functional Sentences Perspective) thematic, the second rhematic:
(P 132) *Ac ar hynny ef a gerdwys...ac a doeth y Lynn Cuch. A phan doeth yno, yd oed Arawn urenhyn Annwuyn yn y erbyn* 'And thereupon he went...and came to Lynn Cuch. And when he arrived there, Arawn King of Annwn was before him.' Also P 145, 221, 339, 348, 437, 467, B 59, 182, 235, 366, 453 and often.

Observation

Note that *-y-* in exx. of *pan y-* is not the converter but the infixed object pronoun 'it', 'him', occurring (in final episodes, anaphorically to earlier ones) with verbs requiring the filling of an object-actant slot: (PKM 64) *pan y gwnaeth Pwyll* 'when P. did it', (PKM 92) *ban y byrywud ef* 'when he struck him', O 815 *pan y kolassei* 'when he had lost him'. With finite forms of <*bot*> '*be*', *y(d/t)-* is typical after *pan* and other junctors; see below.

4.1.3 pan interrogative adverb: 'whence?'

This is, I believe, a homonym of the junctor *pan*, attested in the corpus only in fixed collocations (a feature of older syntax?) with the verb 'to come' (no evidence for lenition, and as a rule in the 2nd person aorist 'Whence do you come?', e.g. P 276, B 148, PKM 61. Also indicative of a different (earlier?) system of syntax is the fact that this is the only case of an interrogative adverbial focus not integrated in the Cleft Sentence pattern, i.e., where the verb is not topicalized by *y(d)-*.[169]

[168] Morgan 1952: 251ff., Ch. xvii, etc.

[169] *Cw(d)* 'where?', not attested in the Four Branches, shares this syntax (Simon Evans 1964: 79; Howells 1967: 142), but clearly conditions initial mutation.

[170] Cornish and Breton have temporal-causal and local *pan, pa-, a-ba-, pe- ban* respectively.

Observation

A comparative note: For consideration as cognates of both or either of the two *pan* homonyms (temporal-conjunctional and local-interrogative,[170] see Lewis-Pedersen 1964: 230 for one current etymological suggestion) the following reflexes of nasal-final labiovelar etyma suggest themselves: Gaulish *ponc*, temporal, Schmidt 1990: 19; Old Irish *can* 'where, whence', with a semantic and syntactic spectrum broader and more varied than its MW cognate, Thurneysen 1946: 289, *Contributions* 'C' 1968: 64f., Vendryes 1987: 29f. and *cuin* 'when', interrogative and 'conjunctional', *Contributions* 'C' 1968: 593; Latin *cum/quom*, temporal, and *un-de*, local; Gothic (and Germanic) *huan*, temporal, Lehmann 1986: 198; Vedic and Sanskrit *kvà* 'where? Whither?' and *caná* 'somewhere', Mayrhofer 1989: 420, 1990: 1528. Bearing in mind that *-u-* following a labiovelar is problematic, that syllabic-nasal reflexes show irregularities and that the morphology of *-n* extensions or affixes is disputable,[171] I believe that the distinction in IE of temporal and local 'pro-adverbials' containing a nasal is very plausible. Admittedly, I know of no synchronic phase in IE in which they are as fully homonymous as in MW; but the reconstructed transition 'where(?)' > 'when(?)' is no less speculative.[172]

4.1 o- 'if'

This important junctor, which is a specific feature of dialogue, has several allomorphs:

(a) *o(t)-*, before verbal nexus:

(1) conditional protasis or conditional circumstant, with the indicative aorist (the 'imperfect', in the case of the 'preterito-present' *guybot* 'know', B 154; the imperfect subjunctive *bei-*, for remote condition). The apodosis (in the case of protatic, not circumstantial conditional): aorist, responsive, Nominal Sentence; imperfect, in remote condition.

(B 311) *Arhoaf, o dowch yn ehegyr* (R *a dowch*) 'I'll wait, if you come quickly'.

(PKM 56) *O guney uygkynghor i nyt ey idi* 'If you follow my advice, you won't go there'.

(PKM 86) *Ony'm llad i Duw hagen nit hawd uy llad i* 'Unless God slay me, it is not easy to slay me'.

(PKM 62) *Ony bei hagyr guelet gur kynurd a thidi yn teimlaw y ryw bryf a hunnu, ny'm torei* 'Were it not unsightly to see a man of such rank as yourself touching such vermin as this, it would not disturb me'.

(O 161f.) *O ffoy di racdaw, efo a'th ordiwed* 'If you flee from him, he will overtake you'—a future predicted 'scenario' narrative type.

(O464f.) A neat alternative of conditional allomorphs: *Namyn ti a guyr dy ti a eill dial Owein o-r-llas, neu y rydhau ot ydiw yg karchar, ac os byw, y duyn gyt a thi* 'But you and the men of your household can avenge Owein if he has been killed, or free him if he is in prison, and if he be alive, bring him back with you'.

[171] Pokorny (1959:647ff.) assigns local reference a special 'root' etymon **k'u-*. MW *cu(d/t)* 'where, whence, whither' (*GPC* 632, not in the Four Branches, but occurring in *Culhwch ac Olwen*, see Bromwich 1988: xxv) comes to mind, illustrating the special treatment of the IE labiovelar before *-u-*.

[172] In Modern Greek, *pou* is the final stage of the evolution from 'where' to 'that', adnominal and consecutive: Jannaris 1968: 167, 414.

(B 217f.) *...hyt-nat-oed lonyd idaw ony chaei dial y sarahet* '...until there was no peace for him unless he took revenge for his insult'. Narrative, yet in fact a kind of inner glimpse, in the 'omniscient narrator's channel', B 154, PKM 84, 86, O 93, 163f., 298, 413f., 465 etc.

Observation

1. The form *ot-* of the junction in (P 182) *ot-gwnn* 'If I know' is difficult. Morris-Jones (1913: 444), Ifor Williams (PKM 118f.), Morgan (1952: 374n.) and R.L. Thomson see this *-t-* as an infixed neutric object pronoun in a fixed expression.

(2) Concessive or topicalizing protasis, with the past tenses:
(PKM 76) *O gwnaethawch gam ymi, digawn y buawch ym poen* 'If you did me wrong, enough have you been in penance' (P 39 is similar: *O-r-gwneuthum gam, mi a brynaf*...).
(B 160f.) Narrative description: *...Ac ot oedd uawr ef, muy dwyweith oed y wreic noc ef* '...and if he was big, twice bigger was his wife than himself'. 'Narrator's channel'.

(3) Postponed circumstant in oath formula, as a rule the negative aorist:
(B 451) *Mefyl ar uy maryf i...onyt agoraf y drws* 'Shame on my beard...if I do not open the door'.
(PKM 59) *Meuyl y mi...ony wylaf i heno* 'Shame on me...if I do not keep vigil tonight'. Also P 516ff., PKM 61, O 416.

(b) *o-s-*, *o-t-*, neg. *ony-t-*

(1) *o-s-* + delocutive Nominal Sentence or nom.rheme, *o-t-* + interlocutive Nominal Sentence: *-s-*, i are here the nexus exponents:
(P 631f.) *O-s-kynghor gennyt ti hynny* 'If this is your advice'.
(P 584) *O-s gwr mwyn vyd y mab* 'If the child turn out a gentle man', (*vs.* 625 *O-r-wyd gwr mwyn* with conditional verbal nexus).
(PKM 73) *O-s da gan-Wydyon uab Don mi a'e gadaf yn llawen* 'If Gwydion son of Don pleases, I shall willingly allow it'; sim. B 37.
(PKM 77) *...ac o-t-wyt-uorwyn, mi a adnabydaf* '...and if you are a virgin, I shall know'.

(2) *o-s* + focalizing nexus: Cleft Sentence, Abnormal Sentence. Nominal focus.
(P 290) *Ie...os hynny a wyny, ...gwna oed a mi* 'Yes,...if that is what you want,...make a tryst with me.
Rarely, adverbial focus.
(B 82) *Dioer, eres genhyf, o-sd uy gwaraduydau a uynhynt, rodi morwyn gystal...ac a rodyssant ym* 'God knows, I find it amazing that, if it is to insult me they wanted, a maiden so excellent should be given...as the one they have given me'.
(PKM 57) *Dioer...cam yd wyt arnaw, os rac uy ouyn i y drygyruerthy di* 'God knows...you are in the wrong, if it is through fear of me that you wail'.

Abnormal Sentence:
(PKM 26) *Os ynteu a uyd, iawnach yw idaw dy gynnhal nogyt i mi* 'If he live(s), it is more proper that he should maintain you than I'.
Also P 373 ('figura etymologica'), 486, B 123.

(3) *o-s-* + noun/adverbial (constituent nexus); more commonly, *ony-t-* + NOUN 'unless it be...', 'excepting':
(B 135) *O-s yr bychanet genhyt to dy iawn* 'If it is due to the smallest of your compensation for you'.
(B 413) *...nac oes, onyt goresgyn o Gaswallawn uab Beli Ynys y Kedyrn* '...(There is no [news]) except the conquering of the Island of the Strong by Caswallawn son of Beli'.
(PKM 82) *Nyt oes in gynghor, ony-t caeu y gaer arnam* 'There is no counsel for us, except to close the castle upon us'; sim 85. Also PKM 52, 61.

(4) *o-s-* + verbal nexus: *-s*—verbal lexeme (or nexus) focusing? A doubtful category:
(P 537) ***Mae ymma mab it, o-s-mynny*** 'Here's a son for you, if you wish'; sim. PKM 50.
(O 162) ***O-s arhoy ditheu efo, a thi yn varchawc, ef a'th edeu yn bedestyr*** '(If you flee from him, he will overtake you); if you (on the other hand) *wait* for him, you being on horseback, he will leave you on foot'.

Observations

2. Historically compounded in all probability of *o-+ ys-*, this allomorph of the junctor was eventually extended, ousting all others and losing its distribution specifics. I suspect it may have been *os-* + verbal nexus with its negative alternant *os nad-* 'If it is that ...not', that triggered this functional extension and eventual demarking.

In ModW, *os-oes-* with statal-adverbial nexus shows the affinity of this junctor to discourse function converters, while *os-yw* with noun-rheme nexus is analogous to the early *pan-yw* (see below).

3. Alternatively, *-s-* here may be taken as the non-syllabic postvocalic form of the infixed object pronoun (See Morgan 1952: 374). For this pronoun, we already have *-y-* after the relative converter *a*—juncturally different from *o*—and after a consonant-final junctor, viz. *pan*; *zero* after the junctor *yny-* and probably after the converter *y-*; as well as possibly *-t-*, see above: *o-s mynny* 'If you wish it/want him'.[173] Needless to say, the validity of this analysis depends on the valency structure of the verbs in point: does *mynny* formally 'require' an object?

4.2.1 tra(w) 'while', '(for) as/so long as'

(a) In narrative, narrated-characters' or narrator's perspective:

(1) *tra-* + preterite/imperfect, *tra-uu* + adjective (Nominal Sentence in narrative):
(PKM 54) ***Tra geffit gantaw ef, nac eskit, na hossan, ny phrynit dim gan gryd yn yr holl dref*** 'For so long as it was to be had from him, neither shoe, nor high boot, was bought from any shoemaker in the whole town'; sim. PKM 52, 58.
(P 436) ***Ny ommeduyt neb tra barhaaawd*** 'No one was refused so long as it (the feast) lasted': *parhau* occurs often in collocation with *tra-*.
(B 197) ...***tra uu da ganthunt*** '(They went on conversing) as long as it pleased them'.
(O 781) ...***tra uu vyw hi*** '(She was his wife) for as long as she lived'

(2) *tra-uei* + *yn-* + infinitive; imperfect subjunctive, for indefinite terms of time:
(PKM 51) ***A guedy y buyta kynta y nos honno, tra-uei y gwassanaethuyr yn buyta, kyuodi allan a orugant*** 'And after the first meal that night, while the servants were at meal, they arose and went out...'—i.e. 'for all the time it might take them to eat'.
(B 463) ***Cany doey ormes byth druy uor y'r ynys hon, tra-uei y penn yn y cud hunnw*** 'For there would never come an invasion be sea to this island, so long as the head is in this hiding-place': Narrator's channel.

(b) In dialogue

(1) With the present subjunctive, expressing a solemnly announced circumstance (note the set phrases):

[173] Cf. ***Culhwch ac Olwen*** 561 *o-s-mynhi* and 505 *o-s-arnaby*.

(P 432) *...tra parhao y wled hon* '...while this feast lasts'; cf. 629f. *...tra barhawyf* '...for as long as I live'.
(PKM 57) *...tra uynho Duw it uot velly...tra welho Duw yn bot yn y dihiruch hunn a'r goual* '...so long as God will it so' '...so long as God see fit that we be in this misery and woe'.
(O 164) *Ac ony cheffy di yno ouut nyt reit ytti amouyn gouut tra vych vyw* 'And if you do not get trouble there, you won't have to look for trouble for as long as you live'. Also O 302, 810.

(2) With the preterite (rare):
(P 169) *Argluydes, sef ar y medwl hunnw yd oedun inheu tra deweis wrthyt ti* 'Lady, it is in this thought that I was too, while I was silent with you'.

4.3 (h)yny'= 'until'

Observations

1. Diachronically, this junctor comprises in all probability a preposition (*hyt-*) governing a generic negative clause in nominal status (**hyt-ny-*). Synchronically, it is in concurrence with *hyt- pan/ban-*, rare in our corpus (B 308, 336 W R, P *eny-*). The combination of *hyt* with *na-* 'that' (e.g. B 469f., PKM 53, 57, 67) still supplies the negative counterpart for *yny-*, which is synchronically inanalyzable and therefore has no negative component.[174]

2. Morphosyntax:[175] the prevocalic *ynyd-* is rare (PKM 58, W). Note the *yny-* lenites in cases in which *ny-* would not have lenited (e.g. *yny-uyd*). Like other converters and junctors, we find following *yny-* infixed objective pronouns: 1st sgl. *-m-* (O 191f.), *-zero-* (blocking lenition!) for the 3rd person sgl. (masc., neutr.): PKM 43.3 r, 45.17, 81.8.

(a) In narrative:

(1) with the preterite, the common unmarked construction (P 644f., B 233f., 343, 365, PKM 53, 54, 84 etc. etc.). With *uu-* + noun (esp. adjective):
(B 145) *...ac y taluyt ebolyon ydaw yny uu gwbyl idaw y dal* '...and he was paid with colts until his payment was complete'.
(B 469ff.) *...a'r pym meib hynny a usagyssant hyt-ban uuant weisson mawr ac yny uedylyssant am uraged ac yny uu damunet ganthunt eu cafael* '...and these five sons they raised until they were big lads and until they throught about wives and desired to take them (wives)'. Note here the opposition between *hyt-ban-* 'until the moment/stage when'[176] and *yny-*.
(PKM 78) *yna y maguyt y mab yn y llys yny uu pedeirbluyd* 'Then the son was raised until he was four years old'.

(2) with the present, in dramatic, vivid narration or description:
(P 113f.) *Y gur a oed yn lle Arawn a ossodes ar Hafgan ym perued bogel y daryan yny hyllt yn hanner ac yny dyrr yr arueu oll...* 'The man who took Arawn's place strikes Hafgan in the middle of his shield's boss until it splits in two and until the armour breaks entirely...'.
(B 384f.) *Emystynu idaw ynteu yn y peir yny dyrr y peir yn peduar dryll* '...he, for his part, stretches himself in the cauldron until the cauldron breaks into four fragments'

[174] *Pace* Howells 1966: 55f., who considers *yny* a 'calque conjunction' following OI *co'*.
[175] See Ifor Williams's notes, PKM 202f., 234, 236, 277; also Morgan 1952: par.139.
[176] Also B 308, 336; cf. *o'r pan* 'from the moment when...', P 158, B 400.

(3) with the so-called 'habitual' or 'consuetudinal' present[177] of <*bot*>, *yny-uyd-*, expressing a resulting ('consecutive') statal final outcome (see below for paradigmatic status):

(P 113ff.) A neat opposition: *Y gwr a oed yn lle Arawn a ossodes ar Hafgan ym perued bogel y daryan yny hyllt yn deu hanner ac yny dyrr yr arueu oll ac yny uyd Hafgan hyt y ureich a'e paladyr dros pedrein y uarch y'r llawr ac angheuawl dyrnawt yndaw ynteu* 'The man who took Arawn's place strikes Hafgan in the middle of his shield's boss until it splits in two and until the amour breaks entirely, and until Hafgan is his arm's and the spear's length over his horse's crupper to the ground, with a fatal blow in him'.

(PKM 75) *Ac yna y kymerth e hutlath ac y trewis Giluathwy yny uyd daran ewic ac achub y llall a wnaeth yn gyflym...a'e taraw a'r un hutlath yny uyd yn garw* 'And then he took his magic wand and struck Giluathwy so that he became a fully grown hind, and quickly caught the other...and struck him with the same wand so that he became a stag'; sim. 76 twice. Also PKM 60, 51, 90, O 648, 750, 752 etc.

(4) (a) With the imperfect indicative of <*bot*>, *yny-oed* + nominal/adverbial rheme (see below for paradigmatic status):

(P 642f.) *Y magwyt Pryderi uab Puyll Pen Annwn yn amgeledus ual yd oed dylyet yny oed delediwhaf gwas a theccaf a chwpplaf o pob camp da* 'Pryderi Pwyll Pen Annwn's son was raised with care as was proper, until he was a most handsome lad, and most fair, and most accomplished in every excellent feat'.

(PKM 58) *Dechreu guageu y'r eskideu o waegeu eureit yny oed ouer a man gueith holl grydyon y dref y urth yr eidaw ef e hun* 'They begun to buckle the shoes with golden buckles until the work of all the shoemakers of the town was useless and insignificant compared with his own'.

(PKM 90), a neat opposition between processual *oed* and final resultative *byd* after *yny-*: *Sef a wnaeth ynteu yr eryr ymelwng yny oed yg kymerued y prenn...ac yna ymelwng idaw ynteu...yny uyd yn y geing issaf o'r pren ...ac yna y trewis Gwydyon a'r hudlath ynteu yny uyd yn y rith e hunan* 'That is what the eagle did, lower himself down, until he was in the middle of the tree...and then he lowered himself towards him...until he was on the lowest branch of the tree. ...Then Gwydion, for his part, struck him with the magic wand so that he was in his own shape (again)'. Also PKM 81, 88, O 67, 132f., 578. (b) With the imperfect subjunction of <*bot*>, *yny-uei* + rheme, expressing subjective intentional statal outcome, conjointly with a 'repetition' or 'duration' component:

(B 376) *Ac yna y byrywyt y kalaned yn y peir yny uei yn llawn* 'And then the corpses were thrown into the cauldron until it was full'.

(PKM 55) *...ac yny uei agos y guyr idaw, kyuarth a rodei y'r cwn, heb gilyaw yrdhunt* '(The boar left the copse and fell back some way from the men), and until the men were close, he would stand at bay against the dogs, without retreating before them'.

The imperfect indicative of other verbs is rare:

(PKM 55) *Ac yn ol y baed y kerdassant yny welynt gaer uawr aruchel* '...And they followed the boar until they saw a huge, extremely high fortress'; the imperfect of *gwelet* 'see' in narrative is unmarked.

(b) In dialogue, only with the present subjunctive: Other verbs : PKM 65, 80, 81, O 104, 107.

[177] A semantically complex category, usually treated (when at all discussed with reference to its functional aspects and not merely from the diachronic morphological angle) in its main-clause occurrences; see for instance Wagner 1959: 66ff., Ellis 1970-2, Skerret 1976.

Observation

3. In summing up, I find the narrative paradigm of [<*bot*> forms + rheme] following *yny* of special interest (for examples, see above):

yny + *byd*: objective, consecutive-resultative
bei: subjective, intentional[178]
bu: objective, narrative-sequential (with focus on final result); existential
oed: subjective, descriptive, non-sequential (focus on both process and outcome) + duration/repetition[179]

5. The conversion system for <bot> 'be' and related themes

The conversion system of <*bot*>, a highly grammaticalized verb so central to the Welsh verbal system, is considerably different from that of the verb lexicon in general, and intricate also because of its complicated suppletive paradigmatics.[180] In broad terms, five out of six nexus types (1.2) are involved:

(1) statal (existential, adverbial-rheme) nexus (the *mae*, *oes* allomorph sub-set);

(2)-(4) noun-rheme; (partly) focalizing and constituent nexus (the *-yw*, *wy=*, *-t-* allomorph sub-set),

(5) verbal nexus (the *b-* and *oed* morph and allomorph sub-sets and tense-mood paradigms).

5.0.1 Tabular overview

The following table presents an inventory of relevant forms.[181] I print in bold such forms or non-attestations as are remarkable in view of the conversion system of other verbs. Non-attestation may be either systemic '(-)', or non-systemic or accidental '(?)' i.e. applicable only to the Four Branches, in which latter case the attested form is given in brackets; parentheses enclose special by-forms; asterisks refer to marginal observations.

5.1 mae, oes, yw: delocutives and existentials

y mae, initial status, P 30f., 225, PKM 41, 53f., 68, 71, 76, 82—*y mae*, non-initial status:

'That', 'that it is'[182] P 30; *y mae* + Nominal Sentence PKM 89, + Cleft Sentence, P 289f., B 116 (*may-* 'that' + Nominal Sentence, O 199)

Adnominal status, attributive to circumstant, P 582; to *possessum*, O 210f.

Topical or rhematic, circumstant and adverbial focusing (Cleft Sentence, with adverbial/infinitival foci; following theme-topic in Abnormal Sentence, P 30f., 61, 316, B 69, PKM 51, 91, O 147f., 549).

[178] Cf. Ernout-Thomas 1953: 372, on Latin *dum* + subjunctive: 'Le subjonctif était plus indique là où se glissait une idée d'intention'—in Late Latin, indeed, *dum* came to introduce final clauses.

[179] The suggested functional opposition of *bu* vs. *oed* is tentative, and must yet be confirmed in the framework of a precise study of *bu* vs. *oed* in other clause types, as well as of the preterite *vs.* imperfect in general.

[180] For an excellent descriptive and diachronic account, see Morgan 1952: 281, 287f., 191ff., 296ff., 301ff., 309ff. etc.

[181] The *Culhwch ac Olwen* system is different: initial (thematic!) *oed* (490ff., 1087); *yt-/yd* also with *yw* and *wyt* (159, 430); normal existential *yssyt*, *yssydynt* (*passim*) and *as-it-* (266).

[182] Morris-Jones 1913: 348.

status, function syntagmatic slot	delocutive mae/oes/yw	interlocutive y=, wy=...	oed	b-forms
subject/object relative, Cleft Sentence Abnormal Sentence	*yssyd* (-)	(-) (-)	*a-/zero-* *a-*	*a-* *a-*
circumstant rel., indirect actant, possessum 'that', post-prep.	*y mae** *y mae**	*yd-* *yd-*	*yd-/**zero*** *yd-*	y-/**lenition** *y- (ytt-)*
initial, un- converted	***y mae**** ***zero?-yd-ys*** impers.**	*yd-* (rare)	*yd* (rare) ***zero*** (remote from reality)	i
focusing	[*neut-oes-*] [*neut-(yd)-* *ydynt*]***	[*neu-t-*] or [*neut-*]?	*neut-*	(-)
interrogative	*a-oes-***** ***mae********	*a-*	*a-*	*a-*
responsive	***zero-oes*** (existence) ***zero-mae*** (state)	(?)†	(-)	(-)
negative, unmarked negative, 'that' negative, responsive	*nyt-oes* *nat-oes* *nac-oes*	*nyt- (ny-t-?)* (-) (-)	*nyt-(yt-††)-* *nat-oed* (?)	ny-
post-rhematic, (pro)nominal rheme††† foll. *sef-* ††† foll. junctors foll. *noc-* foll. *y gyt ac-*	***-yw*** ***y mae, -yw*** ***-(yd)yw*** ***y mae, yt-****†††† ***y mae***	***zero*** (-) ***wyt*** **yd-** ***[zero]***	***zero*** ***zero*** ***zero, yd/t-*** **a-** ***zero***	***lenition*** ***y-*** ***lenition*** **a-, y-** ***y-***

* ModW *y-*, Ø-; *may-* +NS,CS; see 2.2 Obs.

** *yssit* exist. (in poetic sub-text, PKM 43); *ydys* PKM 71

*** *Culhwch ac Olwen* 878

**** 'Is there? 'What about? Where?

† evasive response: PKM 77, 86

†† PKM 5

††† to be discussed specially

†††† P 631

Following *sef*, O 729.
Following *ac*, *noc*, PKM 68, O 392.
zero-mae:[183] responsive, P 537, B 31f. (v.l. *y mae* R), 262, PKM 71, 75.
Allocutive-interrogative: 'What about...?' 'Where is...?', P 256, 479, 554, 619 'What/Who?', B 292f 'What?', 315f. 'What?', PKM 52, 65, 71, O 613 'Where?', 'What about?'

Observation

For the peculiar and widespread use of MW # *mae* ? 'What about...?' 'Where is...?'[184], most discussions are etymological: *GPC* 2304, following Hamp 1985: 201, lists this *mae* as a separate entry and suggests this is the primary and original sense, from which the non-interrogative existential-delocutive *(y) mae* developed. Earlier Morris-Jones 1913: 349, Pedersen 1913: 204, Morgan 1952: 281, Simon Evans 1964: 143, *Branwen* p.xviii. Exx. from the Four Branches (note the use with forms of address):
(B 315f.) *A wyr. ...mae ych kynghor chwi?* 'Oh, men, ...what is your counsel?' (sim.293)
(PKM 52) *Oy a Arglwyd Duw...mae ymifer y llys, ac yn anniuer ninheu namyn hynn?* 'Alas, Lord God...where is the company of the court, and our company too, besides this?'
(O 613) *Ha voruyn...mae yr ireit oll?* 'Oh girl,...where is (or: what about) all the ointment?'

The structure and precise functioning of the interrogative #*mae*...?# are not clear. It appears that in this construction, not attested in Old Welsh, and in fact not before the 13th century the existant is really marked as theme, in that, unlike true existants, it is always definite. I believe the key to this strange construction—in which, contrary to what we normally experience in this kind of syntax, the rheme appears to be zeroed and only the theme is overt—is indeed the zero conversion, signalling the non-autonomous or 'incomplete' status of *mae*. The question expressed is semantically general, neither specifically 'Where?', nor 'What?', but 'What about?', whereas the interrogative *a-* has a definite nexal-question function. The *zero* morpheme in the *mae* conversion subsystem may be a sign of non-actualization as opposed to the *hic-et-nunc* actualizing converters and especially *y(d)-* (see above, 3.2, and cf. the focusing '*Oes, y mae*' in ModW). It is, I believe, also important to bear in mind that *zero*-conversion may signal an allocutive as well as responsive role, cf. the performative and the interrogative-tag role of *na(c)-*.

a-oes (interr.): P 207, B 412, PKM 92
zero-oes (resp.): P 471, O 627, 704
nac-oes (resp.): P 208, B 413f., PKM 92
nat-oes: O 111
yw:
Following nominal rheme, P 127, B 70 and *passim*
Following *pan-*, B 115f., O 462f., 533 (see above, 4.1.3)
Following *sef-*, PKM 76
ot-ydyw: O 465

[183] Hardly 'incorrect', *pace* Howells 1967: 142; also 1966: 39f., 43.
[184] In *Culhwch ac Olwen* we find the construction for 'Where?' (516, 547), 'Who?' (561) and 'What?' (567), all instances concentrated in the same small stretch of text.

Observation

In ModW, *yw* (following *nid-*, *nad-*) alternates with *oes*, the former with specific themes (definite article, personal pronouns/long-zeroable—and generic zero-article), the latter with indefinite ones. Consider the following (from *Pigau'r Sêr* and *Y Faner*: *'Nid yw enw'r awdur yn ddieithr' 'Nid yw annwyd yn ymwelydd aml iawn â mi' 'Nid oes gennyf gof clir' ''Does yna neb yn gwybod', 'Nid yw'n ein gweld ni' 'Nid yw'r grawn o eira-rhew yn drwchus'*. Cases like *'Nid yw/oes Dafydd yn y coleg'* cannot be taken as invalidating this alternation statement (*pace* A. Watkins, *BBCS* 17: 92, 1956-8), since the opposition of 'David' and 'a David'—indeed, 'a david'—is carried in Welsh by the syntagmatic environment, in our case by *yw* and *oes* respectively. The conditioning factor is still the theme. I would point out the following three implications of this alternation: (a) the formal specificity opposition is maintained only in the negative, being neutralized for the affirmative *mae*; (b) this alternative overrules the elsewhere clear-out distinctive of *yw* (noun-rheme nexus) and *mae* (existential adverb-rheme nexus); (c) zero-article 'intensive' generic nouns share the syntagmatics of high-specificity ones, including proper names (f. Shisha-Halevy 1989: 140 *sub* 'Generic (notion) names').

5.2 wy=, y= : interlocutives

This is the interlocutive theme-pronoun set in noun-rheme nexus, but also the theme-pronoun in adverbial-state and topic-theme in focalizing nexus. Note that the initial *w-* counts morphophonemically as vowel, conditioning prevocalic alternants. There are in our corpus hardly any conclusive initial declarative instances.[185]

\# *yd-wy=*: initial status, rare or doubtful: only in adverbial-state nexus, P 403f. (?), PKM 87

—*yd-wy=*: non-initial

'That', nexus nominalization, P 403f.(?)

Adnominal status, attributive to circumstant, PKM 76 (*yd- ywch*)

Following circumstant and adverbial focusing (Cleft Sentence, with adverbial/infinitival/indirect object/*yn*-predicative foci), P 417, 535, PKM 57, 62f., 68, 75, 79, O 551.[186]

zero-wy=

Following nominal rhemes, P 44, 372, 314, 418, O 27, 535 etc.

\# *a-wyt* (interr.): PKM 77, 86

nyt-wyt: B 135

ot-wyt: PKM 77

noc-yd-wyt: PKM 81

5.3 oed

It is often difficult to formulate statements for the opposition of this 'imperfect' form and the 'preterite' *bu* (the grammars are of little help here). It is used both as expression of past existence and of thematicity (*oed* + rheme, rheme + *oed*).

\# *yd-oed*—initial status: no conclusive instances: PKM 69 (?); P 250f. *y rof i a Duw...yd oed neges idi*

[185] See Morgan 1952: 292ff. for examples.

[186] Cf. *Culhwch ac Olwen* 430 *berth yd-ytwyt*.

zero-oed-(adjective)—initial status:

Irrealis apodosis; state or circumstance remote-from-reality P 272f., 614, O 222 (v.l. *ys-oed*), 295f., 390ff., 615

Observation

For *zero + oedd* as the first constituent of the topicalizing-focusing '*oedd, yr oedd*' in ModW, see above. However, in *Yr oedd yn caru Greta, oedd* (Islwyn Ffowc Elis), I see *oedd* as the 'affirming' responsive integrated in a declarative allocution: 'He was in love with Greta, yes he was'; cf *na(c)* as interr. tag in allocution, above.

a-oed (interr.): O 697, 703f. (resp. '*diheu*'. '*oes*' respectively)

—*yd-oed* non-initial

'That', nexus substantivation (also following prepositions), P 14, 117, 642, B 14; PKM 56, O 409.

Adnominal status: attributive to circumstant, P 534, B 105f.

Topical or rhematic, circumstant and adverbial focusing (Cleft Sentence, with adverbial/infinitival/indirect object/*yn*- predicative foci) P 2, 510f., 599, 453, PKM 89; following theme-topic in Abnormal Sentence, P 2, 510.

ytt-oed, following the junctor *pan* 'when', PKM 84, O 242 (apparently a typical post-junctor conversion).

—*a-oed*

Adnominal status: attributive (to actant, existant or theme), P 16, 269, B 240, O 664f., 720.

Topical or rhematic, actant focusing (Cleft Sentence), P 117, B 150; following theme-topic in Abnormal Sentence, P 1.

Actantial substantivation (never zero!) B 179; Following *noc* 'than the one who...', PKM 90, O 359.[187]

—*zero-oed*

In focalizing nexus (Cleft Sentence, with adverbial/*yn*-predicative foci) B 89, 228?, 326.

Adnominal status: attributive (to actant, existant or theme), B 22, 236, PKM 67, 76; topical, actant focusing (Cleft Sentence): existant

Following *sef*-, B 10, PKM 67, O 469, 696, 800 etc.

Following junctors, P 548, B 160, PKM 58, 69, 82 (*pan-oed*).

Following the nominal rheme, P 547, 572, B 20, PKM 73, O 31.

neut-oed: PKM 61.

nat-oed-: P 576, PKM 67.

nyt-oed: P 268, PKM 59.

5.4 b- forms

y-bu-: initial status (rare), B 167.

a uyd (interr.): P 344, 380.

[187] Contrasted with *noc y*-, normal with other verbs, e.g. P 265, PKM 87.

—*y b-*

'That', following preposition, B 520, O 681f.

Following adverbial focus in Cleft Sentence, P 589, B 386.

Following *ac*, PKM 57.

Following *sef*, O 620.

—*a u-*

Adnominal status, B 149, 386.

Topical or rhematic, actant focusing (Cleft Sentence), P 59., PKM 78, 81; following theme-topic in Abnormal Sentence, PKM 84.

Following *noc*, P 99[188]

—*u-* (pertinent lenition):[189]

Post-rhematic (noun rheme nexus), above, 3.4.2, P 331, 335, 538, 601, PKM 63,; in PKM 56 (*uuosti—a golleisti*), this conversion of *bu* is neatly opposed to *a-* conversion for a different verb.

Following adverbial focus in Cleft Sentence, B 325f., O 410.

—*u-* (conditioned lenition): following junctors, P 411, B 376, O 164, 182, 461f.

Observation

The common relative *a uo* (subjunctive) appears to supply the normal thematic (less usually existential) 3rd-person non-modal or 'indicative' future of <*bot*> 'be' in adnominal status, insofar as a future tense can be non-modal—in any case, neither optative nor potential, even if occasionally with a nuance of genericity or of positiveness or inevitability:[190] (B 313) *attep a uo guell* 'any reply that will be better', cf. PKM 70; (PKM 75) *...a'r anyan a uo y'r moch coet bit y chuitheu* '...and the nature that a boar has, you too shall have'; (PKM 80) *...rei a uo llei wynt* 'some that shall be smaller than them', also P 354, B 113, PKM 51, 68, 74 etc.; even (PKM 88) *Duw a uo nerth yt* is not necessarily optative ('May God be your strength'), but may be solemnly declarative ('God shall be your strength').

ry b-: P 379, 589, PKM 81
na-uyd/na-bo: P 344f., 618

6. *A note on ry'=*

This prefixed morpheme, with a postvocalic morphophonemic alternant *-r-* and perhaps a by-form *yr-*,[191] is compatible with most converters (incl. negators), immediately following them in syntagmatic hierarchy. The relative *a-* is usually zeroed before *ry-*.[192] Of the junctors, only *o-* is apparently compatible with *ry-*). It always immediately precedes the lexeme itself, following the infixed pronoun where there is one (e.g. *ny-s-ry-*, O 607): it also occurs before the infinitive.[193] *Ry* is thus evidently, even when prefixed to a finite verb form, a component of the lexical base and not in direct interdependence with the exponents of grammatical categories: in Immediate

[188] In P 150 we have *noc ar a* ... 'than that which has been' (W) varying with *noc ar y* ... (R), which I read as *a ry* ... (*pace* Ifor Williams, PKM pp. 115 and 145; compare P 495. (R); *nag ry-*... (P 325) zeroes *a-*.

[189] Not elision of *y-*, *pace* Pedersen 1913:230.

[190] Note that *byd* P 360 *os ynteu a uyd* means 'live', i.e. is existential; *a-byd=* is also used for other persons, e.g. P 295, 411, PKM 50; also post-rhematically, e.g. P 334.

[191] So for instance Simon Evans 1964: 169; see 3.2 Obs.2 above.

[192] Not '*ry-Ø=*', *pace* Pedersen 1913: 228f.

[193] See Morgan 1952: 253, 366.

Constituents terms, [*ry-* + verb lexeme]. It is therefore structurally, both formally and functionally, different from the converters, and clearly belongs in a different category. Its combinatory and distributional properties are as follows:

(a) In our corpus (the Four Branches), *ry-* almost always occurs in dialogue, mostly with the preterite, marking the action as *perfectum praesens*, often 'egocentric', in the locutive 1st-person sphere (P 39, 160, 346, 383, B 94, PKM 49). It is also found in agitated report (B 69; 263, 1st-person), excited exclamation (P 468f.), or animated accusation (P 325, 483), typically in the context of mischances or alarming circumstances.

(b) With the present indicative, very rare in the corpus, *ry-* expresses a lexeme-intensifying nuance:

(PKM 68) *Ef a ry-eill ych necau* 'He is quite liable (or 'well liable') to refuse you'.[194]

(c) An instance of the present subjunctive *in protasi* appears to combine the same *perfectum praesens* with genericity (PKM 68) *...o ry kyuarfo y guynt* '...once the wind has met [the wisper]', or 'should the wind meet it *first*': for *ry-* expressing anteriority, cf. Latin *prae-*;[195] the etymon of *ry-* (and the prep. *er-/yr-*) must be an Indo-European **p-r-* adverbial, but I cannot see the vocalization pattern(s) clearly (cf. Latin pro-, prae-, per-), nor is it obvious why **pro-* should be the sole candidate as etymon for Brythonic *ry-* (etc.). With the future, *ry-* constitutes a future perfect (P 625 *o-r-byd gur muyn* 'If he shall have turned out a gentle man...', contrasted with P 584 *o-s gur muyn uyd...* 'If he be...'; cf. also P)

(d) We find a few examples of *ry-* in narrative, with the so-called pluperfect (really 'plus quam praeteritum'), all integrating a 'present-situation past' in the 'narrated-time present' (P 173, 240, PKM 60). (P 77) *ry-gyrchuys* is ed.'s emendation, motivated by W's *y gyrchuys*: it goes against the general evidence.

(e) In *Owein* we find several special features of the use of *ry-* not attested in the Four Branches: (1) *ry-*+ infinitive (276, *ry- gaffel*) occurs as object of 'know', i.e. again a case of 'narrated perfect', with the infinitive a form for expressing the verbal nexus with a coreferent agent: 'He knew that he had received...'; (2) A case of relative negative nexus, in dialogue, (607 *ny-s-ry-dycco iarll ieuanc*)—again *perfectum praesens*: 'nothing that a young earl has not taken'; (3) *ry-oed* (relative again), in descriptive narrative (598 *ry-* W; *a-oed* R): *mor hagyr y gwelei y delw ry-oed arnaw...* 'so ugly seemed to him the appearance he held'.

In view of the above, the general opinion,[196] attributing to *ry-* a 'perfective aspect' value seems inexact. This prefix rather adds a 'present perspective' or *hic-et-nunc* component to the past tense, constituting the equivalent of a complex 'perfect' tense (in the sense of the Ancient Greek perfect). This is effected through or conjointly with the intensification or enhancement of the lexical part of the verb, in a mode-of-action ('Aktionsert') characterization. Most of the examples quoted above have this quality in addition to and conjointly with the 'present perfect' temporal reference. This may indeed point to the conflation of cognates of Latin *pro-/prae-* with the intensifier *per-* (the preposition *er-/yr-* and the intensifier *rhy-* clearly belong in this formal and semantic association. Could this also account for the allomorphs and variants *yr-* and *-r-*, the former possibly underlying the latter?). However, this speculation is perhaps unnecessary:

[194] See Strachan 1909: 60: I suspect that it is not *ry-* that conveys the 'possibility' seme in this case, but *gallu* and the aorist; *cf.* West 1981/2: 253f.

[195] See West 1981/2:252.

[196] Morgan 1952: par.133, Simon Evans 1964: 166ff., Pedersen 1913: 275ff. Gagnepain 1964–7 concludes that *ro-* (01) and *ry-* (W) primarily 'virtualize a process'.

cf. the Greek so-called 'perfectum intensivum' or 'emphatic' or 'rhetorical' perfect, morphologically not a compound tense at all (Schwyzer-Debrunner 1966: 263f., 287) and the use of 'present perfect' tenses, when in opposition to a preterite, to lend special substance, weight, relevance or interest to the action (for German, cf. Behagel 1924: 293 '[Tatsachen]...die am Wichtigkeit andere berichtete Tatsachen ueberragen'). In any case, *ry-* is not a converter in the structural definition taken here as basis.

7. Celtic typology and affinities: a personal standpoint

In concluding, I wish to offer some reflections and take a stand on an issue that is uneasy and sensitive as well as weighty, namely the non-Indo-European typological affinities of Celtic.

a. The Pokorny-Wagner substrate hypothesis. Egyptian data

Let me first paraphrase one of Heinrich Wagner's last formulations of his view (see Mac Mathuna 1989: 216): 'There existed in the British Isles, prior to the arrival of the Celts, a population which spoke languages or dialects typologically, though not necessarily genealogically, related to Hamito-Semitic'. This, in fact, was Wagner's more moderate version of the substrate definition: on the other extreme, Wagner claimed a positively Hamito-Semitic substrate and even material, conceptual and institutional borrowing from Semitic and Hamito-Semitic languages (see Wagner 1987: 19ff. and often in earlier papers as well as in Wagner 1959). This latter work, Wagner's monograph on the British verbal systems, is penetrating and insightful from the synchronic-descriptive point of view, but was in general adversely received by fellow-Celtologists,[197] with reactions and reviews verging from the expression of 'discreet distaste' ('notorious excesses' is the expression used in a recent article) to downright hostile or sarcastic (incidentally, these reactions make fascinating reading, being symptomatic of some sociological undercurrents of the discipline).[198] While rejections and summary dismissals of the Pokorny-Wagner view have been legion (by Bergin, Binchy, Dillon, Fowkes, Hamp and others), I find that but few Celtologists responded in a pertinent, objective and informed way to the theory in its totality (so especially Gagnepain, Bergin, Dillon and Binchy). On the whole, the reaction has been consistent with the positivist neo-grammarian Indo-Europeanist diachronism which is still pervasive and often passes for description in Celtic linguistic study.[199] Scepticism is

[197] In the joint review of Rössler and Pokorny (*ZCPh* 28, 1960/1) the former, one of the foremost scholars of Berber and 'Hamito-Semitic' African linguistics, is certainly anything but dismissive. Pokorny's own comments on his disciple's ideas should naturally be viewed in a different light. (I cannot see that Ludwig Stern actually rejected Morris-Jones's hypothesis, as Pokorny says, p.141; see below).

[198] Let me just refer, with no further comment, to Hamp 1957, a patronizing dismissal in trifling and negligent writing on four typewritten pages. If generalizations and universalist argumentation, on the one hand, and data taken 'on trust' from genealogically irrelevant languages, on the other (see e.g. Fife 1988: 117 and often), adduced as argument or illustration of routine or even trivial points, are acceptable in modern scientific exposition,—then I frankly cannot see the methodological blunder, let alone perversion, in systematically adducing and studying affinities between genealogically unrelated languages. Sadly enough, obituaries feature large in this controversy; Wagner's obituary of Julius Pokorny (in *Lochlann* 6, 1974, 73–7) is bitter, making serious methodological accusations with which I find it difficult not to agree, such as an obsession with reconstruction, a neogrammarian simplistic approach, negligence of syntax, characterizing the learned world's attitude to the problems at issue.

[199] One other scholar who concurred in the typological-descriptive *rapprochement* of Celtic and 'Semitic'—Arabic and Hebrew—without however attaching to this any historical claims, was David Greene: see Greene 1966: 34, 39, 45.

still the current attitude today, although, it seems, of a more careful and responsible kind (see Meid 1963 *passim*, Schmidt 1974: 41—as against his earlier views (e.g. Schmidt 1963)—and Sornicola 1989a: 271. In fact, whereas the usual procedure has often been to put a reconstructive (and sometimes even glottogonic) cart before the descriptive horses, Heinrich Wagner preferred to hitch a typological-comparative cart to his; and his horses were unexceptionable.

As one who has for nearly thirty years engaged in research in Egyptian grammar (from Old Egyptian to Coptic), having been trained in Indo-European and Egyptian linguistics, I find it virtually incumbent upon myself to point out that recent and current research on Egyptian linguistics continuously and increasingly corroborates Wagner's essential points; on the other hand, an increasingly better resolution of the Celtic systems and subsystems yields more and more points of similarity.

Wagner's first 'Hamito-Semitic' acquaintance was with Arabic, which he studied in his formative years in Switzerland, yet his argumentation is mainly from Berber and Egyptian. His information concerning the 'Egyptian connection', which came in later years to be the core of his 'Hamito-Semitic' *comparandum*, was only marginally more precise, and no less naïve, than that of Morris-Jones's[200] in the first modern presentation of the 'Hamito-Semitic hypothesis'. Wagner based himself solely on Gardiner's traditionalist, genealogically biased *Egyptian Grammar*, oblivious of modern monographic discussion of Egyptian grammar (by Gunn, Polotsky, Westendorf; later Junge, Satzinger, Schenkel, Groll and others), and especially—which is ironic in view of Ludwig Stern's Egyptian record (see below)—of the whole separate corpus of Demotic and Coptic grammatical study. And yet, it is clear that the better the resolution of the particulars of the emerging Egyptian grammatical systems from Old Egyptian to Coptic, the more striking and detailed the matching with Celtic. To take three instances from Wagner 1977: (210f.), *iw* (Wagner: 'copula') is today generally accepted as an actualizing '*hic-et-nunc*' formal theme (cf. our *y-*, 3.2 above); (225) the '*nominativus pendens*', a construction now well understood as typologically central to the system, and not a marginal 'stylistic' or register phenomenon of 'the colloquial language';[201] (227) *Pr.n.i*: this '*sḏm.n.f* form is not a relative form but a circumstantial as nexal constituent of a 'presentative focalizing' pattern; see above, 2.3.2 on the Abnormal Sentence as a presented-nexus pattern; in fact, this same circumstantial is in later phases of Egyptian a non-initial verb form closely matching Welsh *a-/y-* + VERB of the Abnormal Sentence.[202] The more we find out about the complicated Egyptian *mise en relief* systems (the Cleft Sentence and other topicalization and focalization patterns, studied in detail by Gunn, Polotsky, J. Johnson, Junge, Satzinger, the present writer and others for the various phases of Egyptian and for Coptic), the more closely these are seen to match the Welsh and

[200] 1900[s], in the 'Heroic Age', still partly dilettante, of Egyptology: Renouf, Sayce, Brugsch, Rossi; it was Erman's grammar that opened the modern age of Egyptian linguistics. Morris-Jones was evidently not aware of F. Ll. Griffith's masterly *Stories of the High Priests* and his *Catalogue of the Demotic MSS in the John Rylands Library* (both out in 1900), the two cornerstones of Demotic grammatical study. On the other hand, his sources for Berber are much more solid (Basset, Hanoteau, Masqueray.)

[201] E.g. Bergin's criticism, 1938: 214, of Pokorny's use of this feature to support his theory (see also Dillon in *TPhS* 1955). Needless to say, the attestation in Celtic of *segmentation* or topicalizing extraposition cannot be taken in itself and alone as significant; it must rather be weighed for *valeur* in a system of oppositions to the other topicalizing and focalizing means. The same is true for the Cleft Sentence and related patterns; and indeed, in Old/Middle Egyptian, and again in Demotic-Coptic, this construction is of significance only in the context of topicalization and *mise en relief* patterns.

[202] Shisha-Halevy 1986 par.2.5.

Irish ones (even though precise functional matching is here, almost by definition, out of the question).

b. 'Sprachverwandtschaft, Sprachmischung'

In his illuminating discussions of the concept of *Sprachverwandteschaft* and *Sprachmischung* (see the references following these entries in the index to Spitzer 1928), Hugo Schuchardt—pre-eminent Romanist, descriptivist and comparativist of many European and non-European languages, founder of creole studies and modern sociolinguist *avant la lettre*, theoretician of language relatedness and language evolution, a sworn intellectual individualist[203] and anti-neogrammarian, probably one of the greatest and wisest linguists of all times—repeatedly pointed out that, while 'genetic unrelatedness' can never be proved, linguistic relatedness is extremely complex, and is in fact always constituted as a cluster of linguistic and extralinguistic (ethnological, social, cultural and historical) relationship data, often minute details;[204] if (as is usually the case for 'ancient' languages) some or most of these data are for some reason not available or partial and shadowy, this hardly implies their non-existence, negligibility or triviality.[205] After all, and metaphorical jargon notwithstanding, language is not an organism, but an especially complex kind of social activity; and in fact, like other kinds of social activity, languages are invariably 'mixed':[206] 'Zwei Sprachen mischen sich nicht wie zwei ungleichartige Flüssigkeiten, sondern als verschiedene Tätigkeiten eines und desselben Subjekts'. Admixture occurs between genealogically related or unrelated languages, just as typology transsects genealogical grouping: 'Jede Sprache erfreut sich mehrere Verwandtschaften', of which the genealogical relatedness is but one, and usually not the one based on and constituted by 'innere Form' (i.e. on structure) criteria.[207]

All this, I believe, is of relevance to our question, putting as it does the 'identity of a language' in the right perspective—not as a 'mutated' type, but as a coherent conglomerate of features held in a network of innumerable extralinguistic relationships.

c. Contactless non-geographical Sprachbund

The concept of *Sprachbund*—now generally understood as 'a language group with typological affinity (sometimes in conflict with genealogical relatedness), correlated with geographical contact or proximity'—is nowadays increasingly familiar, although but uneasily integrated in comparative linguistics,[208] and, properly speaking, belonging in the unfortunately still marginal framework of areal linguistics. (A classic account of a classic *Sprachbund*, viz. the Balkan one, is Sandfeld 1968; others describe or define the North-West-European one, and contain also

[203] See Spitzer 1928 Nos.172, 262, 760, 767 and others.

[204] See Spitzer 1928 *passim*, e.g. 88ff.

[205] It is of course imperative not to ignore the weight—according to some, primacy—of spoken language in any comparison, especially of the typological kind, although it is invariably seen (at best) only 'through a glass darkly' in cases like those under discussion here.

[206] Ibid. 150ff., 170ff., 193f.

[207] Ibid. 196f., 228ff.; thus Schuchardt incidentally rejects the ascendancy of the 'genealogical criterion' over typological criteria for 'grammatical profiling'.

[208] Cf. the plaintive 'Sprachbund situations are notoriously messy', Thomason-Kaufman *apud* Sornicola 1989b: 445 n.16; is not genealogical grouping too, and for that matter language itself, 'messy'?

typological evaluation of Celtic phenomena: Beckman 1934, De la Cruz 1972);[209] other interesting *Sprachbünde* are the Caucasian-Iranian-Armenian-Neo-Aramaic(-Turkish), or the Ethiopian (Semitic and non-Semitic languages) ones. Now, although the 'geographical contact' componential criterion is to my knowledge common to all conceptions of *Sprachbund* (see Kattein 1986), I nevertheless suggest that we must allow *a priori* for synchronic cases of typological convergence not correlated with any geographical contiguity or proximity. Two instances of this case that I am aware of are the Turkish-Amharic typological affinity, see Polotsky 1960b; Basque and Caucasian, often discussed by Schuchardt and others. I propose that we should view the non-Indo-European affinities of Celtic in this light. For it is by now an incontestable fact that Celtic syntax (in the broadest sense of the term, verging on synonymity with 'systeme de grammaire') deviates from any Indo-European 'norm', by any definition[210]—a deviation that is reconfirmed again and again by increasing resolution of grammatical features, central as well as marginal (it is still early days for making lexical and phraseological statements to the same effect; this is certainly true for the comparison of cultural institutions, where matching would indeed imply historical contact, but where the danger of slipping is very serious: for instance, Wagner's study of Egyptian *m3't* in *ZCPh* 31 [1970] is naïve and even in some respects misinformed); and strikingly, in the progressively cumulative evidence of such features, Celtic grammar resembles Egyptian, Berber and Semitic languages. In the course of the description of Mabinogi syntax above, I have had occasion to observe on cases of typological similarity of MW to Egyptian and other African languages (e.g. adverbial-rheme nexus; *yr hwn a-* as a complex concording relative pronoun; the special indefinite-antecedent relative syntax and the determination of the entire [antecedent + relative] complex; the responsive). In forthcoming discussions (of the Cleft Sentence, focalization and *mise en relief* in general; of certain narrative tenses; of the Nominal Sentence) I hope to treat other striking isoglosses.[211] I would thus suggest that a systemic and far-reaching agreement does exist between Celtic and the non-Indo-European languages referred to, an agreement that may be described as a 'discontinuous non-geographical *Sprachbund*' grouping.[212] I count myself among those who at present consider this affinity to be (Wagner's words, Wagner 1987:20) 'of purely "structural" interest', but I must

[209] Beckman's fascinating monograph is especially pertinent in the present context. It brings home sharply the divergence of the Celtic languages from the NWE type, even in the construction of the Cleft Sentence; see pp.14 and 42.

[210] This realization is earlier than our century: I find it expressly voiced by G. Ascoli in 1887 (quoted in Havers 1911: 255 n.1 (and see 255f.).

[211] Other comparables (beside those usually adduced in the Pokorny-Wagner literature) include the pronoun series; the habitative 'tense' category; the '*izafet*'-type [noun + noun] determinative phrases (also once determinated for the whole phrase); the use of the *augentia* (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1986 Chapter 6); the functional profile of *o-*, e.g. as a 'nota relationis' in [(pro)noun + noun] phrases (*hyn o beth, kyfryd o wirion, nofelydd o Babydd, 'Druan o Gymru!'*; see Shisha-Halevy 1986 Chapter 4), and 'partitively' in relative phrases: *...ac a glywassynt o gerd* (B 428f.) 'of what they had heard of song', cf. Arabic *min-*, Wright 1967: 135ff.; the striking analogy between the functional spectrum of unconditioned (pertinent) lenition and the Arabic 'accusative' (*-an*); The definite article in the addressed noun (*Tyrd i mewn y babi clwt!*, Kate Roberts), cf. Shisha-Halevy 1989: 49ff.—and again, in that arcane and elusive, yet tangible, gamut of idiosyncrasies ranging from phraseology through turn of expression to syntax pure and simple, the closer one looks the more striking the similarities.

[212] W. Meid's contention that typology can 'only bring out important general traits of the linguistic structure' (Meid 1984: 323) is surprising; the highly complex individuality 'finger-print' of a language is constituted by many subsystems and innumerable grammatical, lexical and phraseological phenomena, including relationships between entities and phenomena. And, of course, the statements made above are never in the sense of a 'total typology' (that of a 'linguistic type', always a matter of high arbitrariness, 'blind spots' and wishful thinking) but of 'partial' typology.

object that 'of no historical relevance at all' does not follow from this: I confess myself agnostic as regards the historical facts at the roots of this typological convergence. ('Coincidental' as an attribute of this convergence is *ipso facto* meaningless, in this context of systematic grammatical correspondence).

Observation

Ludwig (Christian) Stern (1846–1911), German Egyptologist and Egyptian-Coptic linguist turned Celtic philologist, is somewhat of a mystery figure. His *Koptische Grammatik* of 1880, still in many respects the best grammar of the two major Coptic dialects, was written while he was 'Directorial-Assistent beim ägyptischen Museum zu Berlin', responsible for the papyrus collections; in 1905 we find him 'Director of MSS' in the Royal Library there, removed from all Egyptological interests: he is known to have refused offers of Egyptological chairs in Göttingen and Leipzig. In the Eighties he edited the *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*; from the beginning of this century and until his death, he co-edited with Kuno Meyer the *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*. The crisis and turn in his research interests and activities seems to have come about sharply, towards the end of the Eighties: thereafter, all publications under his name are Celtological (with his name signed as Ludwig *Christian* Stern), and none on Egyptian or Coptic; all philological and literary, none specially grammatical. As is well known, Stern edited several basic Celtic texts, among others the definitive edition of the Würzburg OI glosses and Dafydd ap Gwilym's poetry, and made numerous invaluable contributions to the ecdotics and establishment of Celtic texts, both Goidelic and Brythonic, as well as to elucidation of literary issues.

In his autobiography, *Mein Werden und Mein Wirken* (Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer, 1929, see pp.114, 166ff., 191, 257 etc.), Adolf Erman, the founder of Modern Egyptian linguistics, gives his frank if personally biased version of Stern's break with Egyptian. Stern ('Ludovicus noster', to the students) befriended Erman at first, lending the young student working in the Museum great technical assistance (not a matter of course in those days and that place) and even generously guiding him through the fog of Middle and Late Egyptian with keen grammatical observations (and that, before the first scientific grammars of Egyptian were written). In time, however, Erman came to rival Stern, eventually replacing him as Lepsius's successor, and Stern regarded him as his enemy. The disappointed Stern became morose and suspicious; he was accused of blocking access to the manuscripts, and was eventually promoted and transferred to the Royal Library, according to Erman 'to the detriment of the other librarians'. So it may have been Adolf Erman who was responsible for Egyptology's loss and Celtology's gain: in fact, Stern's estrangement from Egyptian grammar and Egyptology seems to have coincided with Erman's meteoric rise (1880-1889) which culminated in the 'Annus mirabilis' of 1889, when Erman's *Sprache des Papyrus Westcar* appeared, virtually opening the age of modern Egyptian linguistics: a milestone which Stern, by then outside the Egyptological circle, did not share. Stern's injunction to his wife just before his death, '*alles verbrennen!*' is recounted by Kuno Meyer, who managed to exclude Stern's books from that fate (see Ó Lúing's 1991 biography of Kuno Meyer, p.103ff.): it was in keeping with Stern's temperament, but also explains in part the remarkable lack of information about this 'celtologist without a past'. Following his death, two obituaries appeared in 1912: in the *Zentralblatt fur Bibliothekwesen* (by E. Jacobs) and in the *Zeitschrift fur Celtische Philologie* (by Kuno Meyer). No *Nachruf* was offered by any colleague of his Egyptological days.

A faint echo from Stern's Egyptological and grammarian past resounds in Stern's review of Rhŷs, *Celtic Folklore, Welsh and Manx* (Oxford 1901) in *ZCPh* 3:605-613, where, reporting on Morris-Jones's comparative Celtic-Egyptian observations (p.613), he contributes one of his own: Coptic *ntof*, 3rd-singular-masculine 'independent pronoun' and enclitic sentence particle ('Konjunktion'), functionally compared with Welsh *ynteu*.

Ludwig Stern's following words from the Rhŷs review are, I think, worth quoting as a proper conclusion to this very personal typologistic digression:

Wer möchte nun behaupten, nicht, dass die beiden Wörter formverwandt seien, sondern dass die abgeleitete konjunktionale Bedeutung in der späteren welschen Sprache ohne eine Einwirkung der altern ägyptischen nicht denkbar sei? Wie in diesem Falle verhält es sich in allen übrigen, wenn man der Sache auf den Grund geht. Aus gar vielen Sprachen könnte man in der Konstruktion des Subjekts und des Prädikats, in der conjugatio periphrastica, in der Art der Hervorhebung, in der Suffigierung der Pronomina, im Gebrauch der Partikeln u.s.w. ein dem celtischen ganz ähnliches Verfahren nachweisen. Wenn der Mangel oder das Absterben der Flexion die Zuflucht zu syntaktischen Mitteln zu nehmen nötigt, so ist es nicht verwunderlich, wenn sich sonst weit getrennte Sprachen in der Wahl dieser Mittel begegnen.

I see this as a sober structural formulation, which does not rule out the possibility of very old or very ill documented historical connections, but considers them marginal and indeed irrelevant. 'Unexpected similarities between languages' may well be, and primarily are, 'adumbrations of the lawlike interdependencies of linguistic properties' (Greenberg 1973:163), but still may also be 'adumbrations' of historical circumstances of which we know little or nothing. What is important, and ought not to suffer from over- or under-emphasis of typological idiosyncrasy, are still the linguistic facts.

Terminological Defining Glossary

Actant: one of the basic nominal or pronominal constituents of the verb phrase, with which the verb lexeme itself enters a rectional (governed) dependence: **agent** ('subject'), adverbals (**object(s)**, sometimes **predicatives**), 'partner'. The actantial inventory defines an idiosyncratic **valency profile** for every verb.

Actualizer, actualization: the grammatical feature(s) serving, in addition to their other functions, to integrate and 'realize' an abstract, potential, notional element of *la langue* in the text, i.e. in actual discourse (*'la parole'*): the determinators ('articles'), some pronouns, person/number and tense/mood markers are all actualizers.

Adnexal: a complex dependence, overlaying an attributive dependence with a nexal interdependence: the **satellite** is accordingly **rhematic**, the **nucleus** (a phrase or clause) **thematic**.

Category: the *signifié* ('class meaning') of a grammatical paradigm: person, gender, tense, are all morphological categories.

Circumstant: ungoverned (that is, 'optional') adverbial expansion of the verb lexeme. Not entering into the valency pattern of the verb, its absence is not meaningful.

Clause: a syntagm in which some type of nexus interdependence obtains.

Communicative Dynamism (Prague School linguistics): a relative and gradient quality of an element or elements in an information stretch: the degree to which it or they advance the communication.

Converters: exponents or marks prefixed to nexal clauses signalling their micro- and macro-syntactic status (in the complex clause or in the text, respectively).

Copula: the formal signal or exponent (*'signifiant'*) of nexal interdependence ('nexus'); varies according to nexus type, and may be lexical, morphologic, tagmemic or prosodic.

Deixis: indication: oriented reference of textual elements with regard to space and time, esp. in relation to the interlocutive and delocutive situations.

Delimitation: the cancelling or negation of a **link**: a feature signalling break of cohesion or of a continuity bond in a specific textual stretch.

Delocutive: pertaining to the 3rd-person (non-participant in dialogue) personal perspective. (Note that the delocutive pronouns are not personal pronouns, properly speaking, but phorically tagmemic operators).

Determination (of noun): the most important actualizing characterization complex of the word-class 'noun', consisting of various, often compatible, feature signalling (e.g. [in]definiteness, [non]specificity, [non]phoricity, [un]quantifiedness, [un]possessedness, [un]expandedness, properness/appelativity.

Existential statement: a special type of clause, stating the existence in the 'world of discourse' of a term ('existant'), located or unlocated (or 'absolute'), and its subsequent availability as nexus constituent (theme or rheme), thus introducing it into linear discourse.

Focus: in the ultraclausal textual information unit ('block'): the element(s) or textual segment carrying the center or highlight of an information block. The focus may, in clause extent, coincide with the rheme. **Focusing** (marking as focus) may be effected by various tagmemic (syntactic, morphologic, prosodic) feature.

Functional Sentence Perspective (extended application of Prague School terminology): the value of a clause or of its constituents, in the frame of its cotext (as 'information block'), with regard to the givenness/presupposition or newness of information; also its highlighting, fore- or backgrounding, and so on (see **Communicative Dynamism; focus; rheme; theme; topic**).

Interlocutive: pertaining to the 1st-2nd (dialogue participant) persons. (Note that the interlocutive pronouns are proper 'naming' personal pronouns—they are not phoric, but self-referential, serving to directly localize the dialogue partners' respective spheres.

Link: a cohesive feature: a feature signalling and affirming cohesion or of a continuity bond in a specific textual stretch.

Neutralization: the cancelling (in a given environment) of an **opposition**.

Nexus: the special interdependence signifying the **predicative linkage** of theme and rheme; which is the predicative clause actualization of a phrase. Different types of nexus refer to different rhemes, themes and copulas.

Nucleus: the constituent of a syntagm (phrase) that defines and signals its commutation properties—its paradigm. The 'grammatical center'.

Opposition: the interrelationship between members ('terms') of a paradigm.

Pattern: an ordered and bounded (delimited) sequence of paradigms/categories.

Paradigm: substitution-class: set or class of elements, forms, syntagms, patterns that are intercommutable (with a change of meaning) in a given micro- or macro-textual environment. (NB: the traditional grammar-book inflection/conjugation 'paradigm' is not a structural category: it is not a true substitution-class.) The *signifiant* of a **category**.

Phrase: any syntagm that is not a clause.

Predicative linkage: different from all other types of linkage, this institutes as discrete two entities or concepts, simultaneously throwing a bridge across the ensuing gap. Whereas other linkages (such as *article+noun*, *noun+attribute*, *verb+actants* other than the agent) are synthetic and establish a complex unity, the predicative one is analytic.

Presentative: a grammatical element introducing a noun, pronoun or nexus into discourse, in a combination of existential statement and deixis marking.

Rheme: one of the two main constituents of the basic information structure of the nexal clause: the constituent that conveys new information about the theme.

Satellite: the expansion constituent of a phrase, expanding the **nucleus**.

Syntagm: a bounded combination of two or more segmental elements in the text: a syntagm may be **continuous** (in immediate linear sequence) or **discontinuous** (interrupted).

Texteme: subtextual componental signalled and bounded unit manifesting idiosyncratic systems of grammar: the **dialogue** and the **narrative** are among the basic textemes, further refinable and combinable into numerous others.

Theme: one of the two main constituents of the basic information structure of the clause: the information-basis segment (given presupposed or taken for granted) in the clause extent for the point (message) made in it. The theme is constituent that least advances the communication made by the clause.

Topic: in the ultraclausal textual information unit ('block'): the element(s) or textual segment that, being cotext- or context-bound, feature the cohesive factor of 'what is being discussed' within the block. Formally, the topic (which but rarely coincides with the theme in clause extent—the theme typically represents it: 'The cat? *she* has gone out', '(As for) me, *I* shop at Sainsbury's', 'Alice, *she* rarely remembers my birthday') signals and affirms textual continuity and cohesion. Topicalization: marking as topic.

Bibliographical References

Ahlqvist, A. 1978. 'On Preposed Adverbials', *Scottish and Gaelic Studies* 13: 66–80.
Ahlqvist, A. 1985. 'The Syntax of Relative Marking in Old Irish', *FLH* 6/2: 323–46.
Ahlqvist, A. 1974. 'Notes on "Case" and Word-Boundaries', *Ériu*, 25: 181–9.
Armbruster, C. H. 1960. *Dongolese Nubian: A Grammar* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
Awbery, G. M. 1984a. 'Sentence Particles in Spoken Welsh', *BBCS* 31:17–30.
1984b. 'Welsh', in Trudgill, B. (ed.), 1984, 259–77.
Bader, F. 1974–5, 'Vieil-irlandais *nó*, *no-* et les formes tokariennes apparentees, *EC*, 14: 391–403.
Ball, J. 1987/8. 'The Erosion of the Welsh Pre-Sentential Particle System', *SC*, 22/3: 134–45.
Ball, M. J. 1988a (ed.), *The Use of Welsh: A Contribution to Sociolinguistics* (Clevedon, Pa.: Multilingual Matters).
Ball, M. J. 1988b. 'Variation in Grammar', in Ball (ed.), 1988a: 58–69.
Ball, M. J.—Fife, Poppe, and Rowland, 1990 (eds.). *Celtic Linguistics—Ieithyddiaeth Geltaidd: Readings in the Brythonic Languages: Festschrift for T. Arwyn Watkins* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: J. Benjamin).
Barri, N. 1981. 'Aoristic Present, Subjunctive and Converters in Modern Greek', in Young (ed.) 1981, 1–20.
Baudiš, J. 1916. 'Notes on the Preverbal Particles and Infixed Elements', *Ériu*, 8: 108–113.
Baudiš, J. 1933. 'The Particle EW *yt yd y*', *RC* 50: 388–405.
Beckman, Nat. 1934. *Västeuropeisk syntax: Några nybildningar i Nordiska och andra Västeuropeiska Språk (Goteborgs Högskolas Arsskrift XL 1934: 4)*, (Göteborg).
Behaghel, O. 1928. *Deutsche Syntax III: Die Satzgebilde* (Heidelberg: Winter).
Benecke, G., W. Muller, and F. Zarncke. 1963. *Mittelhochdeutsches Worterbuch*, II (Hildesheim: Olms).
Bergin, O. 1938. 'On the Syntax of the Verb in Old Irish', *Ériu*, 12: 197–269.
Blumenthal, P. 1979. 'Zur kommunikativen Funktion von Adverbien und Umstandsbestimmungen im Französischen', *Rom. Forschungen*, 87: 295–332.
Boyle, D. 1973. 'ACH and AGUS as Coordinate and Subordinate Conjunctions in Gaelic', in Corum, Smith-Stark and Weiser, 1973 (eds.), 220–8.
Bromwich, R. and D. Simon Evans. 1988 (eds.). *Culhwch ac Olwen* (Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru).
Cardona, G. R. 1989. *Dizionario di Linguistica* (Roma: Armando).
Carruba, O. 1969. *Die Satzeinleitende Partikeln in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens* (Roma: Ateneo (=Incunabula Graeca XXXII)).
Contributions: *Contributions to a Dictionary of the Irish Language*, 'C (1–3)' (ed. Ní Chatháin, O'Daly *et al.*), 1968–74; 'S' (ed. Joynt, Condon *et al.*), 1953 (Dublin: The Royal Irish Academy).
Corum, C., T. E. Smith-Stark, and A. Weiser. 1973 (eds.). *You Take the High Node and I'll Take the Low Node: Papers from the Comparative Syntax Festival* (Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society).
Cuendet, G. 1939. 'Sur l'expansion de la particule relative', in *Mélanges de linguistque...Charles Bally* (Genève: George et Cie.), 93–100.
Davies, S. 1989. 'Y Fformiwla yn Pedeir Keinc Y Mabinogi', *Ysgrifau Beirniadol*, 15: 47–72.
Debrunner, A. 1930. 'Sprachwissenschaft und klassische Philologie', *IF*, 48: 1–25.
De La Cruz, Juan M. 1972. 'A Syntactical Complex of Isoglosses in the North-Western End of Europe (English, North Germanic and Celtic)', *IF* 77: 71–80.
Denez, P. 1974. 'A Structural Approach to Breton Grammar: the So-Called Relative Pronoun in Breton', *SC*, 9: 251–67.

Dillon, M. 1947. 'Celtic and the Other Indo-European Languages', *TPhS* (1947), 15–24.
Durante, M. 1982. *Dal latino all'italiano moderno* (Bologna: Zanichelli).
Ellis, J. 1965. 'The Grammatical Status of Initial Mutations', *Lochlann* 3: 315–30.
Eriksson, O. 1980. *L'attribut de localisation et les néxus locatifs en français* (Göteborg (Acta Univ.Gothob., Romanica, Gothoburgensia XVIII)).
Ernout, A., and F. Thomas. 1953. *Syntaxe latine*² (Paris: Klincksieck).
Eska, J. 1991. 'First Person Emphatic and Imperative in Early Irish', *BBCS*, 38: 87–9.
Evans, D. Simon. 1950. 'Nodiadau cystrawennol', *BBCS* 13: 188–92.
Evans, D. Simon. 1964. *A Grammar of Middle Welsh* (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies).
Evans, D. Simon. 1968. 'The Sentence in Early Modern Welsh', *BBCS*, 22: 311–37.
Fife, J. 1986a. 'Literary vs. Colloquial Welsh: Problems of Definition', *Word*, 37: 141–51.
Fife, J. 1986b. 'The Semantics of *gwneud* Inversions', *BBCS*, 33: 133–44.
Fife, J. 1988. *Functional Syntax: A Case Study in Middle Welsh* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnistw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskijego).
Fife, J. 1990. *Semantics of the Welsh Verb: A Cognitive Approach* (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press).
Fife, J. and E. Poppe. 1991 (eds.) *Studies in Brythonic Word Order* (Amsterdam–Philadelphia: Benjamins).
Fleischman, S. 1990. *Tense and Narrativity: From Medieval Performance to Modern Fiction* (London: Routledge).
Fleischman, S. 1991. 'Discourse Pragmatics and the Grammar of Old French', *Romance Philology*, 44: 251–83.
Fleuriot, L. 1984. 'La particule introductive de phrase 'na' en breton et en cornique', *EC*, 21: 223–30.
Frei, H. 1968. 'Réponse partielle et réponse totale', *CFS*, 24: 7–13.
Friedrich, J. 1960. *Hethitisches Elementarbuch* I (Heidelberg: Winter).
GPC: *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru*. 1950–. (Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru).
Gagnepain, J. 1962-3. 'La sémiologie du verbe celtique', *EC*, 10: 413–33.
Gagnepain, J. 1967. 'Préliminaires à l'étude de la relation en celtique', *SC*, 2: 1–7.
Gagnepain, J. 1973. 'La sémiologie du verbe celtique II', *EC*, 13: 361–82.
Gildersleeve, B. L. 1980. *Syntax of Classical Greek* (reprint of 1900–1911) (Groningen: Bouma).
Goldenberg, G. 1966. 'The Amharic Tense-System' (Jerusalem (Hebrew University Ph.D. thesis. Hebrew, English summary)).
Goldenberg, G. 1971. 'Tautological Infinitive', *Israel Oriental Studies*, 1: 35–85.
Greenberg, J. H. 1973. 'The Typological Method', in *Current Trends in Linguistics*, II ed. Th.A. Sebeok (The Hague) 149–93.
Greene, D. 1966. *The Irish Language* (Dublin: Cultural Relations Committee of Ireland).
Greene, D. 1972. 'The Responsive in Irish and Welsh', in Pilch and Thurow, 1972 (eds.), 49–72.
Greene, D. 1973. 'Synthetic and Analytic: a Reconsideration', *Ériu*, 24: 121–33.
Greive, A. 1974. *Neufranzösische Formen der Satzfrage im Kontext* (Mainz (= Abh.Akad.d. Wiss., Geistes- u. Sozialwiss. Kl., 3)).
Gresillon, A. 1980. 'Zum linguistischen Status rhetorischer Fragen', *Zeitschrift f. germ. Linguistik*, 8/3: 273–89.
Gruffydd, W. J. 1928. *Math Vab Mathonwy* (Cardiff: Univ. of Wales Press).
Gunn, B. 1924. *Studies in Egyptian Syntax* (Paris: Geuthner).
Halliday, M. A. K., and K. Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English* (London: Longmans).
Hamp, E. P. 1951. 'Morphophonemes of the Keltic Mutations', *Lg*, 27: 230–46.

Hamp, E. P. 1957. 'Hamites and Kelts and Substratum', *General Linguistics*, 2: 43–7.
Hamp, E. P. 1973. 'Inordinate Clauses in Celtic', in Corum, Smith-Stark and Weiser, 1973 (eds.), 229–51.
Hamp, E. P. 1985. 'Varia', *EC*, 22: 199–202.
Harris, M. 1986. 'Aspects of Subordination in English and Other Languages', *Bull.John Rylands Library*, 69: 195–209.
Hartmann, C. G. 1966. *Emphasizing and Connective Particles in the Thirteen Principal Upanishads* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia) (=Ann.Acad.Scient.Fennica, B 143,2).
Hartmann, H. 1960. 'Der Typus *ocus e* im Irischen', in *Indogermanica: Festschrift W. Krause* (Heidelberg: Winter), 8–23.
Havers, W. 1911. *Untersuchungen zur Kasussyntax der indogermanischen Sprachen* (Strassburg: Trübner).
Havers, W. 1926. 'Sprachliche Beobachtungen an den altirischen Glossen', *IF*, 43: 207.
Henry, A. 1960. *Études de syntaxe expressive, ancien français et français moderne* (Bruxelles-Paris: Presses Universitaires/Pressees Universitaires de France).
Henry, P. L. 1978. 'Bergin's Law and Syntactical Subordination in Irish', *ZCPh*, 36: 29–53.
Hjelmslev, L. 1928. *Principes de grammaire générale* (Copenhague: Bianco Lunos Bogtrykkeri).
Howells, D. 1966. 'The Nasalizing Relative Clause', *SC*, 1: 38–62.
Howells, D. 1967. 'Notes on Syntax', *SC*, 2: 138–46.
Jannaris, A. N. 1968. *An Historical Greek Grammar* (reprint of 1897) (Hildesheim: Olms).
Jones, D. G. 1988. 'Literary Welsh', in Ball 1988a (ed.), 125–71.
Jones, M. 1970. 'Preliminary Outline of the Finite Verb Phrase in Welsh', *SC*, 5: 94–147.
Jones, M. and A. R. Thomas. 1977. *The Welsh Language: Studies in its Syntax and Semantics* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press).
Jones, R. M. 1974. 'The Welsh Indicative', *SC* 9: 229–50.
Jones, R. M. 1975/6, 'The Article in Welsh', *SC* 10/11: 326–44.
Kapeliuk, O. 1968. 'The Language of Conversation (Dialogue) in Modern Amharic Literature' (Jerusalem (Hebrew University Ph.D. thesis. Hebrew, English summary)).
Kattein, B. 1986. 'Zur Definition des Begriffs Sprachbund', *Sprachwissenschaft*, 11: 276–87.
King, G. 1993. *Modern Welsh: A Comprehensive Grammar* (London: Routledge).
Korzen, H. 1985. *Pourquoi et l'inversion finale en français* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard) (= suppl. de la Rev.Rom., 30).
Koschmieder, E. 1945. *Zur Bestimmung der Funktionen grammatischer Kategorien* (Abh.Bayr.Akad.d.Wiss., Philolog.-histor.Abt., NF 25) (=*Beiträge zur allgem.Syntax* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1965, 9–69).
Kühner, R. and B. Gerth. 1955. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache: Satzlehre* (Leverkusen: Gottschalk).
Kühner, R., and F. L. A. Stegmann. 1976. *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache: Satzlehre* (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung).
Lambert, P.-Y. 1981. 'La traduction du pronom relatif latin dans les gloses en vieil-irlandais', *EC*, 18: 121–33.
Lambert, P.-Y. 1987. 'Les gloses grammaticales brittoniques', *EC*, 24: 285–308.
Lambert, P.-Y. 1992. 'La relative 'nasalisante' en vieil-irlandais', *BSL*, 87: 225–64.
Lehmann, W. P. 1974. *Proto-Indo-European Syntax* (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press).
Lehmann, W. P. 1986. *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary* (Leiden: Brill).
Leumann, M., J. B. Hofman, and A. Szantyr *et al.* 1965. *Lateinische Grammatik* II (Munchen: Beck).
Lewis, H. 1942. *Brut Dingestow* (Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru).
Lewis, H. 1946. *Datblygiad yr Iaith Gymraeg* (Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru).
Lewis, H. 1949. 'Y Cymal Perthynol Afrywiog', *BBCS*, 13: 128–30.

Lewis, H. and H. Pedersen. 1961. *A Concise Comparative Celtic Grammar*' (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
Lewy, E. 1942. '*Der Bau der europäischen Sprachen*', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, XLVIII, C No. 2.
Lewy, E. and H. Wagner. 1967. 'Versuch einer kurzen Beschreibung des Altirischen', in W Meid, 1967 (ed.), 217–22.
von Lexer, M. 1974. *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* (reprint of 1878) (Stuttgart: Hirzel).
Löfstedt, E. 1936. *Vermischte Studien zur lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax* (Lund: Gleerup).
Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics*, II (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press).
Mac Cana, P. 1966. 'An Old Nominal Relative Sentence in Welsh', *Celtica*, 7: 91–115.
Mac Cana, P. 1973. 'On Celtic Word Order and the Welsh 'Abnormal' Sentence', *Ériu*, 24: 90–120.
Mac Cana, P. 1975/6. 'Notes on the Affixed Pronouns in Welsh', *SC*, 10/11: 318–25.
Mac Cana, P. 1977. *The Mabinogion* (Cardiff: Univ. of Wales Press).
Mac Cana, P. 1979. 'Notes on the "Abnormal Sentence" ', *SC* 14/15.
Mac Cana, P. 1990. 'Word Order in Old Irish and Middle Welsh: An Analogy', in Matonis & Melia 1990 (eds.), 253–60.
Mac Cana, P. 1991. 'Further Notes on Constituent Order in Welsh', in Fife and Poppe, 1991 (eds.), 45–80.
Mac Coisdealbha, P. 1977. 'Die Syntax des Satzes im Altirischen', in Schmidt 1977 (ed.), 34–43.
McCone, K. 1980. 'The Nasalizing Relative Clause with Object Antecedent in the Glosses', *Ériu*, 31: 10–27.
Mac Mathuna, S. 1989. H. Wagner Obituary, *EC*, 26: 215–17.
Markey, Th. L. 1987. 'Connectives and Deixis: The *and/og-* Isogloss in Old High German', in *Althochdeutsch* (ed. Bergman, Tiefenbach and Vötz), I (Heidelberg: Winter), 380–94.
Matonis, A. T. E., and D. F. Melia (eds.). 1990. *Celtic Language, Celtic Culture* (E. Hamp Festschrift) (Van Nuys: Ford and Bailie).
Mayrhofer, A. 1989–90. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen, 6–7* (Heidelberg: Winter).
Meid, W. (ed.). 1963. *Die indogermanischen Grundlagen der altirischen absoluten und konjunkten Verbalflexion* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
Meid, W. 1967. *Beiträge zsur Indogermanistik und Keltologie (Festschrift Pokorny)* (Innsbruck: Sprachwiss. Inst. Univ. Innsbruck).
Meid, W. 1984. 'Bemerkungen zum Verhältnis von genetischer und typologischer Sprachbetrachtung', in A. Bernabé (ed.) *Athlon. Satura Grammatica in Honorem Fr. R. Adrados*, I (Madrid: Gredos), 323–4.
Morgan, T. J. 1952. *Y Treigladau a'u Cystrawen* (Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru).
Morris-Jones, J. 1989/1900. 'Pre-Arian Syntax in Insular Celtic', = Appendix B in John Rhys and D. Brynmor Jones, *The Welsh People* (London: Fisher Unwin), 617–41.
Morris-Jones, J. 1913. *A Welsh Grammar* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
Morris-Jones, J. 1931. *Welsh Syntax: An Unfinished Draft* (Cardiff: Univ. of Wales Press).
Oftedal, M. 1962. 'A Morphemic Evaluation of the Celtic Initial Mutations', *Lochlann*, 2: 93–102.
Ó Sé, D. 1986. 'The Copula and Preverbal Particles in West Kerry Irish', *Celtica*, 18: 98–110.
Ó Siadhail, M. 1973. 'Abairtí Freagartha agus Míreanna Freagartha sa Nua-Ghaeilge', *Ériu*, 24: 134–59.
Ó Siadhail, M. 1989. *Modern Irish: Grammatical Structure and Dialectal Variations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Ó hUiginn, R. 1986. 'The Old Irish Nasalizing Relative Clause', *Ériu*, 37: 33–8.

Pedersen, H. 1913. *Vergleichende Grammatik d. celtischen Sprachen*, II (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht).
Pilch, H. 1971. 'The Syntactic Study of Colloquial Welsh', *SC*, 6: 138–57.
Pilch, H. and J. Thurow. 1972 (eds.). *Indo-Celtica: Festschrift A. Sommerfelt* (Munchen: Hueber), 49–72.
Polotsky, H. J. 1960a. 'The Coptic Conjugation System', *Orientalia*, 29: 392–422 (= 1971: 238–68).
Polotsky, H. J. 1960b. 'Syntaxe amharique et syntaxe turque', in *Atti del Convegno Intern. di Studi Etiopici* (Roma: Acc. Naz. dei Lincei), 117–21 (= 1971: 3–7).
Polotsky, H. J. 1965. *Egyptian Tenses* (Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, II/4) (= 1971: 71–96).
Polotsky, H. J. 1971. *Collected Papers* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press).
Polotsky, H. J. 1976. 'Les transpositions du verbe en égyptien classique', *Israel Oriental Studies*, 5: 1–50.
Polotsky, H. J. 1987–90. *Grundlagen des koptischen Sprachbaus*, I–II (Decatur: Scholars Press) (= American Studies in Papyrology 28–9).
Poppe, E. 1989/90. 'The Position of Temporal Adverbials with NOS as core in Middle Welsh Sentences—A Functional Approach', *SC*, 24/5: 117–29.
Poppe, E. 1990a. 'Constituent-Ordering in Breudwyt Maxen Uledic', *BBCS*, 37: 43–63.
Poppe, E. 1990b. 'Word-Order Patterns in *Breudwyt Ronabwy*', in Ball, Fife *et al.* 1990 (eds.), 445–60.
Quattordio, A. M. 1965, 'Sintagmi nominali predicativi in indiano antico e in celtico', *Studi e Saggi Linguistici* (Suppl. 'L'Italia Dialettale'), 5: 56–64.
Richards, M. 1970. *Cystrawen y Frawddeg Gymraeg* (Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru).
Richards, M. 1948. 'Syntactical Notes: I, The Negativing of the Verb Noun in Welsh', *EC*, 4: 369–78.
Rohlfs, G., 1966–8. *Grammatica Storica della Lingua Italiana e dei suoi Dialetti* (Torino: Einaudi).
von Roncador, M. and Bublitz, W. 1979. 'Abschweifungen', in Weydt 1979 (ed.), 285–98.
Rosén, H. 1989. 'Periphrasis and Figura Etymologica in Some Sources of Middle Irish', *ZCPh*, 43: 53–83.
Rosén, H. B. 1973. 'Satzbau und augmentloses historisches Tempus im homerischen Tatsachenbericht', *FL*, 6: 315–330.
Rothenberg, M. 1971. 'Les propositions relatives a antécédent explicite introduites par des présentatifs', *Ét.Ling.Appliquée*, n.s., 2: 102–17.
Rowlands, E. 1980. 'Y Frawddeg Gymysg a'r Frawddeg Dro', *BBCS*, 28: 218–22.
Rowlands, E. 1982. 'Sylwadau Pellach ar Gystrawennau'r Frawddeg Gymysg a'r Frawddeg Dro', *BBCS*, 29: 674–80.
Rychner, J. 1970. *L'articulation des phrases narratives dans la MORT ARTU* (Faculté des Lettres Neuchâtel, Genève: Droz).
Rychner, J. 1971. 'Analyse d'une unité transphrastique: La séquence narrative du même sujet dans *La Mort Artu*', in Stempel, W.-D., *Beiträge zur Textlinguistik* (München: Fink, 79–122).
Sabatini, F. 1983. 'Prospettive sul parlato nella storia linguistica italiana (con una lettura dell) 'Epistola napoletana' del Boccaccio', in *Italia Linguistica: Idee, Storia, Strutture*, ed. Leoni, Gambrara, Lo Piparo, Simone (Bologna: Il Mulino).
Sadock, Jerrold M. and Zwicky, Arnold M. 1985. 'Speech Act Distinctions in Syntax', in Shopen 1985 (ed.), 155–96.
Sandfeld, K. 1968. *Linguistique balcanique: problèmes et résultats* (Paris: Klincksieck).
Satzinger, H. 1976. *Neuägyptische Studien: die Partikel IR. Das Tempussystem* (= Beihefte zur WZKM, 6) (Wien: VWGÖ).

Sbisa, M. 1981. 'Tempo ed aspetto nel presente dei verbi performativi: considerazioni pragmatiche', in *Tempo verbale: strutture quantificate in forma logica* (Firenze: Accademia della Crusca), 131–57.
Schmidt, K. H. 1963. Review of Wagner 1959, *ZDMG*, 113: 347–51.
Schmidt, K. H. 1972. 'Tocharisch und Keltisch, historisch-vergleichend und typologisch betrachtet', in Pilch and Thurow 1972 (eds.), 195–200.
Schmidt, K. H. 1974. 'Das Verbum im Keltischen: sprachgeschichtliche Grundlagen und typologische Entwicklung', *ZCPh*, 33: 28–44.
Schmidt, K. H. 1977 (ed.). *Indogermanisch und Keltisch* (Kolloquium d. indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Wiesbaden: Reichert).
Schmidt, K. H. 1982. 'Keltisch-hittitisches', in *Serta Indogermanica* (Festschrift G. Neumann) (Innsbruck: Sprachwiss. Inst. d. Universität).
Schmidt, K. H. 1989. H. Wagner Nachruf, *ZCPh*, 43: 226–9.
Schmidt, K. H. 1990. 'Zum plomb du Larzac', in Matonis and Melia 1990 (eds.) 16–25.
Schwarze, M. G. and H. Steinthal. 1850. *Koptische Grammatik* (Berlin: Dümmler).
Schwyzer, E. and H. Debrunner. 1966. *Griechische Grammatik, II: Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*³ (München: Beck).
Sebeok, Th. A. *et. al.* 1973 (eds.). *Current Trends in Linguistics* 11 (The Hague and Paris: Mouton).
Serianni, L. 1988. *Grammatica Italiana* (Torino: UTET).
Shisha-Halevy, A. 1981. 'The Oracular Conference: a Text-Linguistic Case Study in Late Egyptian', *FLH*, 2: 133–43.
Shisha-Halevy, A. 1986. *Coptic Grammatical Categories: Structural Studies in the Syntax of Shenoutean Coptic* (Rome: Pontifical Institute).
Shisha-Halevy, A. 1987. 'Grammatical Discovery Procedure and the Egyptian-Coptic Nominal Sentence', *Orientalia*, 56: 147–75.
Shisha-Halevy, A. 1988. *Coptic Grammatical Chrestomathy* (Leuven: Peeters).
Shisha-Halevy, A. 1989a. *The Proper Name: Structural Prolegomena to its Syntax—a Case Study in Coptic* (Vienna: VWGÖ).
Shisha-Halevy, A. 1989b. 'Work-Notes on Demotic Syntax I', *Orientalia*, 58: 28–60.
Shopen, T. 1985 (ed.). *Language Typology and Syntactic Description* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Sieg, E. H., W. Siegling, and W. Schulze. 1931. *Tocharische Grammatik* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht).
Skerrett, R. A. Q. 1976. 'The Meaning of 'Habitual'', *Celtica*, 11: 251–4.
Sornicola, R. 1988. 'Il relativo in irlandese antico. Una riconsiderazione', *IF*, 93: 124–67.
Sornicola, R. 1989a. 'Il relativo in irlandese antico. Una riconsiderazione, II', *IF*, 94: 234–71.
Sornicola, R. 1989b. 'L'interferenza rivisitata (anche a proposito di alcuni problemi di storia linguistica romanza', *Medioevo Romanzo*, 14: 435–68.
Sorrento, L. 1950. *Sintassi Romanza* (Milano-Varesi: Cisalpino).
Speijer, J. 1886. *Sanskrit Syntax* (Leiden: Brill).
Speijer, J. 1896. *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax* (Strassburg: Trübner).
Spitzer, L. 1928. *Hugo-Schuchardt-Brevier*²*: ein Vademecum der allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft* (Halle (Saale)).
Streitberg, W. 1910. *Gotisches Elementarbuch*⁴ (Heidelberg: Winter).
Strachan, J. 1909. *Introduction to Early Welsh* (Manchester: The University Press).
Thomas, B., and P. W. Thomas. 1989. *Cymraeg, Cymrâg, Cymrêg: Cyflwyno'r Tafodieithoedd* (Caerdydd: Gwasg Taf Cyf.).
Thomas, C. H. 1974. 'The Verbal System and the Responsive in a Welsh Dialect of South-East Glamorgan', *SC* 9: 271–86.

Thomas, W. 1960–4. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch* (Heidelberg: Winter).
Thomson, R. L. 1957. *Pwyll Pendeuic Dyuet* (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies (Mediaeval and Modern Welsh Series, I)) (P).
Thomson, R. L. 1968. *Owein* (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies (Mediaeval and Modern Welsh Series, IV)) (O).
Thomson, D. S. 1976. *Branwen Uerch Lyr* (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies (Mediaeval and Modern Welsh Series, II)) (B).
Thorne, D. A. 1984. 'Sylwadau ar rai Treigladau', *BBCS*, 31: 74–86.
Thurneysen, R. 1961. *A Grammar of Old Irish* (reprint of 1946) (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies).
Tobler, A. 1894. *Vermischte Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik, II* (Leipzig: Hirzel).
Tobler, A. 1899. *Vermischte Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik, III* (Leipzig: Hirzel).
Tobler, A. 1902. *Vermischte Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik, I²* (Leipzig: Hirzel).
Togeby, K. 1982. *Grammaire française*, I (Copenhague: Akademisk Forlag).
Trudgill, P. 1984 (ed.). *Language in the British Isles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Vachek, J. (with J. Dubsky). 1960. *Dictionnaire de linguistique de l'École de Prague* (Utrecht-Anvers: Spectrum).
Vaillant, A. 1977. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves, 5: Syntaxe* (reprint of 1950) (Paris: Klincksieck).
Vendryes, J. 1987. 1960. *Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien*, 'C', 'MNOP' (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies).
Wagner, H. 1959. *Das Verbum in den Sprachen der britischen Inseln* (Tübingen: Niemeyer).
Wagner, H. 1969. 'The Origin of the Celts in the Light of Linguistic Geography', *TPhS*, 1969, 203–50.
Wagner, H. 1972 (with W. Dressler). 'À propos de la grammaire du discours en breton', *EC*, 13: 153–70.
Wagner, H. 1977. 'Wortstellung im Keltischen und Indogermanischen', in Schmidt 1977 (ed.), 204–35.
Wagner, H. 1987. 'The Celtic Invasions of Ireland and Great Britain', *ZCPh*, 42: 1–40.
Watkins, C. 1963. 'Preliminaries to a Historical and Comparative Analysis of the Syntax of the Old Irish Verb', *Celtica*, 6: 1–49.
Watkins, T. Arwyn. 1988/8. 'Trefn yn y Frawddeg Gymraeg', *SC*, 12/13: 367–95.
Watkins, T. Arwyn. 1983/4. 'Trefn y Constitwentau Brawddegol yn Branwen', *SC*, 18/19: 147–57.
Watkins, T. Arwyn. 1987. 'Constituent Order in the Old Welsh Verbal Sentence', *BBCS*, 34: 51–60.
Watkins, T. Arwyn. 1988. *Constituent Structure in the Positive Declarative Sentence in the Medieval Welsh Tale 'Kulhwch ac Olwen'* (Innsbr.Beiträge, Vorträge u. kleinere Schriften, 41, Innsbruck: Sprachwiss. Inst. Univ. Innsbruck).
Watkins, T. Arwyn. 1990. 'Constituent Structure in the Negative Declarative Sentence in the White Book Version of "Kulhwch ac Olwen" ', in Matonis and Melia 1990 (eds.), 247–52.
Weinrich, H. 1977. *Tempus. Besprochene und erzählte Welt²* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).
West, J. 1981/2. 'Preverbs in Gothic and Old Irish: a Typological Parallel?', *SC*, 16/17: 248–58.
Weydt, H. 1979 (ed.), *Die Partikeln der deutschen Sprache* (Berlin–New York: De Gruyter).
Williams, Ifor. 1951. *Pedeir Keinc Y Mabinogi²* (Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru).
Williams, J. E. Caerwyn. 1976. 'MIW *neu, neut* as copula, *Celtica*, 11: 278–85.
Williams, J. E. Caerwyn. 1981. 'Remarks on a Linguistic Drift', *Celtica*, 14: 67–82.
Williams, S. J. 1980. *A Welsh Grammar* (Cardiff: Univ. of Wales Press).

Wilmet, M. 1976. *Études de morpho-syntaxe verbale* (Paris: Klincksieck).
Wright, W. 1967. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language* (repr. of 1896–8) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Wunderli, P. 1975. 'Der Prosatz 'non'. Substitutionsprobleme im Rahmen der transphrastischen Syntax', in Wunderli and Schecker 1975 (eds.), 43–71.
Wunderli, P. and Schecker. 1975 (eds.). *Beiträge zum Problem der Textualität* (Tübingen: Niemeyer).
Young, D. W. 1981 (ed.). *Studies Presented to H. J. Polotsky* (Beacon Hill: Pirtle & Polson).
Zumthor, P. 1983. *Introduction à la poésie orale* (Paris: Ed. du Seuil).